DC
252.5
C21E
1815

Carnot

Memorial

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

Second Edition. 1815.

MEMORIAL

OF

M. CARNOT,

LIEUTENANT-GENERAL IN THE FRENCH ARMY, KNIGHT OF THE ORDER OF ST. LOUIS, MEMBER OF THE LEGION OF HONOR, AND OF THE INSTITUTE OF FRANCE,

ADDRESSED TO

HIS MOST CHRISTIAN MAJESTY, LOUIS XVIII.

TO WHICH IS SUBJOINED,

A Sketch of M. Carnot's Life,

TOGETHER WITH

Some remarkable SPEECHES which he made on former occasions in the National Convention and Tribunat.

And to which is now added,

THE LETTER

OF

MEHÉE DE LA TOUCHE,

ADDRESSED TO

HIS MAJESTY LOUIS XVIII.

TRANSLATED from the FRENCH MANUSCRIPT COPIES,

BY LEWIS GOLDSMITH,

Author of 'The SECRET HISTORY OF THE CABINET OF BONAPARTE,' Editor of the Antigallican Monitor, &c. &c.

LONDON,

PUBLISHED BY T. HOOKHAM, JUN. AND CO. OLD BOND STREET.

London, printed by T. Wood,
No. 22, Russell Court, Drury Lane.

DC
252.5
C21E
1815

A FEW WORDS FROM THE TRANSLATOR.

IT is seldom that a Pamphlet of so small a size as that which I now offer to the Public, requires any introduction; but it is from a personal motive---that is, to justify my own political character, that I feel myself bound to offer a few words by way of preface.

Translators and Biographers are generally supposed to be of the same principles as those of the author whose work they translate, or whose life they write. To clear myself from such an imputation I must here declare, that I entirely disapprove of

1066539

the leading principles, and many assertions contained in M. Carnot's pamphlet.

What induced me to translate it was, that as, from the high and in some respects just reputation in which that gentleman's talents are held, it might be supposed that a charge brought forward by him was both serious and well supported; it was proper therefore to shew the contrary to the people of this country, by exhibiting the work itself.

M. Carnot seems to think that the Republicans in France may shortly expect to be prosecuted and persecuted for their opinions; but I think that the very circumstance of his being at large and unmolested after the circulation of his pamphlet, is the best proof of the mildness of the present Government of France, and the utter improbability of his suspicions being ever verified.

The way the Memorial got into circulation is thus related---M. Carnot, in July last,

put it into the hands of a printer, who communicated a proof-sheet to one of the King's Ministers, the Count de Blacas. This gentleman desired the Director-General of the Police, M. Beugnot, to see Carnot, and expostulate with him on the impropriety of sending forth opinions into the world which he must have known from his own experience to have produced such misery in France.

M. Beugnot sent for M. Carnot, and communicated to him the conversation he had with the King's Minister. Carnot said, that "the only motive he had for printing the Memorial, which (he said) he never intended to offer for sale, was, that the King might read it, as he thought that Kings seldom read any manuscript works."---"If that is your only motive (said M. Beugnot), then I will engage that the King shall read it in manuscript, and will inform you to-morrow if his Majesty has any objection to its being printed."

On the following day M. Beugnot informed M. Carnot that his Majesty had read it, but that he thought it might as well not be printed for the present. "In that case (said M. Carnot) it shall remain in manuscript."---Only a few copies in manuscript were circulated among M. Carnot's particular friends, and it is from one of those copies that I have made the translation. A short time after, the memorial was printed, but in a garbled and mutilated state; in consequence of which the author addressed a letter to the Editors of the French papers, in which he stated that the Memorial was printed without his knowledge.

The reader will see that there are many doctrines (which Mr. Burke has denominated "seducing theories") laid down in the pamphlet, which might have been well suited to the opinions of Frenchmen, in 1789; but after France had seen *noyades*, *fusillades*, and *portable* and *permanent* guillotines, to enforce the doctrines which M.

Carnot so much professes to admire, and the practice of which doctrines inflicted so much misery on his country, I think that his publication might have been dispensed with. Indeed it requires more than an ordinary share of assurance for a man whose name always appeared joined with that of Roberspierre, in organising a system of carnage and devastation unprecedented in the annals of history, to come forward with an attempt to recommend the adoption of those doctrines which made France one great Charnel-house.

What that system was at the time when Carnot was a member of the Revolutionary Government, is thus properly described by one of his countrymen, and who was also of his own dear demagogical school, namely, Prudhomme, who in his "*Crimes de la Revolution,*"---says, "*Le règne de la convention a un caractère de perversité qu'on ne retrouve point dans l'histoire d'aucun autre peuple. Avec beaucoup de recherches, nous*

n'avons pu rencontrer une nation au sien de laquelle les crimes aient été commis aussi longuement et avec autant d'impunité qu'en France. Les trente tyrans d'Athènes n'étaient que des apprentifs dans la carrière des forfaits, comparés aux sept cent cinquante conventionnels de France."

As M. Carnot's Work has excited a great sensation in this country, I have thought proper to subjoin, as an appendix, some account of his life, as well as some of the most remarkable speeches delivered by him in the Convention and *Tribunat*.

LEWIS GOLDSMITH.

Oct. 21, 1814.

MEMORIAL, &c.

The social state, such as we view it, is, properly speaking, nothing but a continual struggle between the desire of ruling, on the one side, and the wish to withdraw from subjection on the other.

In the eyes of the partisans of indefinite liberty, all power, be it ever so confined, is illegitimate; in the eyes of the partisans of absolute Government, every species of liberty, be it ever so limited, is an abuse. By the former, it cannot be perceived by what right any man could presume to govern them—the latter cannot conceive what right any man can have to attempt to affix limits to their authority. The one party maintain the perfect equality of all men; the other the innate prerogative which some men possess, to hold dominion over others.

From this conflict of opinion and pretension have arisen our intestine divisions, and it is difficult, while the imagination is influenced by the horrors of those disor-

ders, to arrive at an impartial decision in a discussion of this nature. Each party is eager to charge the other with all the errors which have been committed. Those whom the former state of things had placed over others, impute all our misfortune to a failure in submission on the part of the latter, whilst the latter attribute them to the arbitrary privileges of the former, and to their obstinacy in defending such absurd and ridiculous privileges.

To be impartial on such a subject, a man should be able to divest himself of all kind of prejudice; should transport himself, in idea, into future ages, and even in this case should be ignorant of historical results; should lay aside the propensity almost irresistible of judging of every thing by the event.

It is true that the manner of deciding most questions is in some respects justified, on account of the errors to which abstract theory always leads. The Revolution furnishes melancholy proof of this to future ages; that was prepared by volumes of publications purely philosophical; the mind raised by the expectation of a degree of happiness till then unknown, made excursions into the region of fancy. We thought that we had laid hold of the phantom of national felicity. We thought that it was possible to obtain a Republic without anarchy; an unlimited liberty without disorder; a perfect system of equality without factions. Experience has undeceived us most cruelly. What remains to us after so many chimeras vainly pursued?---Regrets---prejudices against all kinds of perfection; the discouragement of a multitude of good men, who have at length seen the inutility of their efforts. You men who wished to be free have failed, and of consequence all the crime

will be imputed to you. You are guilty persons, to whom pardon is provisionally offered---on the condition of taking back your former chains, rendered more heavy by a sense of pride, which slept for such a long time in a state of humiliation, and now, *in the name of Heaven*, dipped in the spirit of revenge.

And what, during the Revolutionary storm, has been the conduct of those men who would bring back your chains? Have they indeed a right to accuse others of evils which they have suffered? Is it not to themselves that the name of Assassin and of Regicide is applicable which they so prodigally lavish on you? And do not they resemble those pick-pockets who, that they may turn the suspicion from themselves, cry out "Stop thief!" with a louder voice than any other, whilst they are looking for an opportunity of losing themselves in the crowd?

What! say those traitors, are not those who have voted for the death of the King the Regicides? No, the Regicides are the persons who took up arms against their native country. It is you yourselves who are. The others have voted as judges appointed by the nation, and are not obliged to account for their judgment to any one. If they fell into an error, they are in the same circumstances as other judges who have erred. They have erred together with the intire nation which provoked that judgment, and urged it as it were by thousands of addresses sent in from the Departments and from the districts. They have erred in common with all the nations in Europe who treated with them, and which would be at this very day in peace with them had not the one as well as the other been equally the victims of a new Upstart.

But you, Sirs, who return after the storm is over, how

do you pretend to justify yourselves for having so unmercifully refused your assistance to that King whom you affect to lament—you, to whose cupidity he sacrificed the resources of the public treasury---you, who by the perfidy of your counsels drew him into a labyrinth from which he could not be extricated but by your own proper efforts? Why did you refuse those gratuitous offerings for which he asked you? why did you refuse him those additional aids which your depredations had rendered indispensible? What did the Notables do for him? What, the Clergy? Who were they who incited the States General? who were they who caused a general insurrection through all France,and who, when the Revolution had once commenced, found themselves capable of stemming the torrent? If you could do it, why did you not? If you could not, why reproach others with not having stopped it?

Louis XVI., you say, was the best of Kings: did you not abandon him in the most cowardly manner, when you saw him in that danger into which you had precipitated him? Was it not your duty to form a rampart round him with your bodies? Was not the oath which you took that you would defend him to the last drop of your blood? If he was the father of his subjects, were you not the children of his choice? Was it not for you that he had run himself in debt? Was it not to satisfy your rapacity that he deprived himself of the affection of his other children, and you left him, without support, to the mercy of those whom you had irritated against him? Was it the business of Republicans to defend with their tongues him whom you had not the courage to defend with your swords? What would those Republicans have to rest upon for their support,

who, contrary to their own interest, might have wished to save the King? When you ran away was it not evident that they would have sacrificed him and themselves uselessly---that they would have been the victims of a popular commotion? You exact from others a virtue more than human, whilst you yourselves give an example of desertion and of felony.

Louis was no longer King when his trial was over: his destruction was inevitable; he could not reign from the instant that he was deprived of the means of keeping the factions under. It follows that the death of Louis should be imputed—not to those who pronounced his condemnation, as the fate of a sick person whose life is despaired of is pronounced--but to those who having it in their power to arrest his fate in the beginning of a disorderly movement, found it more expedient to quit a post so dangerous.

You draw a frightful picture of the Revolution; the more frightful it is the more criminal are you, for it is your work---you are the authors of all the calamities which have resulted from it; expiate---(you cannot do better)---expiate your cowardice and ingratitude to Louis XVI. by annual sacrifices in the temples.

You do not demand, as you piously express yourselves, but the punishment of the great criminals---and it is yourselves who are the great criminals: others might fall into an error;---that is a question; but on your treason no question can be raised. You were the first-born of that King---you who had every thing from his weakness---you have and always will have to reproach yourselves with the crime of parricide; and Louis might have addressed you in those last words of Cæsar to Brutus---"*Tu quoque fili mi!*"

How does it happen then that the first authors of the martyrdom of Louis XVI., the real instigators of our civil commotions, are the persons who in the present day take to themselves the parts of accusers? How happens it that others who have courageously braved the Revolution in the midst of its vicissitudes, find themselves at once struck as it were with stupor, and appear to suffer condemnation from their hypocritical clamours? It is only from the singularity of the events, that their weak adversaries have become the stronger. It is because the enemies of the French name, with whom they leagued themselves, had, by the advantage of numbers---ten to one---got possesion of the capital without resistance.--- That when one instant sufficed to efface twenty years of glory and of victory, those who had fled at the moment of danger, returned in triumph behind the baggage waggons, and that thus twenty years of glory and of victory have become twenty years of sacrilege and of outrage.

Had the system of liberty prevailed, things would have borne far different names; for in the annals of the world, the same action, according to circumstances, at one time is a crime, at another an act of heroism. The same man is at one time a Claudius---at another a Marcus Aurelius. Cataline is but a vile conspirator. If like Cæsar he had been able to found an empire, he would have been esteemed a benefactor. Cromwell was acknowledged till his last hour, and his protection sought by all Sovereigns. After his death his body was suspended on a gibbet: he only wanted a son like himself to enable him to form a new dynasty. So long as Napoleon was fortunate, Europe bowed down to him.--- The first Princes thought it an honour to ally themselves with his family---As soon as he fell, there was nothing

seen in him but the miserable adventurer, cowardly, and without talent. PELOPIDAS, TIMOLEON, ANDREW DORIA, were proclaimed the liberators of their country; they would have been nothing but factious men, like the *Gracchi*, had they failed in their enterprises.

Since the perpetually renewed vociferations of the first authors of the death of LOUIS XVI. force those who have voted as judges to justify themselves, though they could not by any means have prevented it, it will not be difficult for the latter to make it evident, that that vote is absolutely conformable to the doctrine taught by our schools, saving the permission of Government, extolled, by way of excellence, as the doctrine, inasmuch as it is the doctrine of Holy Writ, supported by the opinion of moralists who are considered the wisest of all antiquity, and the most proper to be for ever quoted as authority.

CICERO, for example, expresses himself in the following manner, in the 2d book of his Offices, chap. 8. "The reasons which may prevail on a man to subject himself to a state of dependence on any one, and so submit to his domination, are almost the same as those which would prevail on him to do him a favour; for it is done through friendship, or the great obligations of gratitude, or in consideration of his merit, or from the expectation that good will be the result—or from fear—or from this, that a man may be forced when he is not disposed to comply with good-will—or because one suffers himself to be dazzled by hopes or by promises---or, as we have often seen in the Republic, because one is gained over by a bribe.

"Now the best way of preserving, whatever portion of credit and consideration we may happen to possess, is to make ourselves loved, and the worst is to make ourselves feared; for, as it is very happily expressed, "*Men*

hate those whom they fear, and desire to see those perish whom they hate." Though we had not known from any other source that there is neither power nor grandeur which can hold out against the public hatred, that which we have seen would have taught it to us. But the assassination of that tyrant (CÆSAR) who has oppressed the Republic by the force of his arms, and who still holds it in servitude, though he is dead, is not the sole example which has clearly proved how pernicious and fatal to the most exalted rank is the public hatred. We see it besides in the end of all the other Tyrants, who have almost without exception perished in the same manner. We must acknowledge therefore that hatred is but an indifferent guarantee of a long life, and that on the contrary there is no guard so safe as that of love, and even that there is no sure or solid safety but that.

" Let us leave severity and cruelty to those who think they may have occasion for them, for the purpose of keeping in subjection a people whom they have oppressed by force; as for those who enjoy the benefits of civil and political freedom they cannot possibly adopt a more inconsiderate line of conduct than to behave in such manner as to cause themselves to be feared; for although the laws are, as it were, buried under the power of an individual, and that liberty is confined through fear, they sometimes raise their heads, and because the people give hints what their sentiments are without any formal explanation, and that by agreement they raise at once to the Sovereign magistracy persons qualified to draw the Republic from oppression; now the return of liberty, which lay under restraint, and is interrupted, causes itself to be much more cruelly felt than any thing which the people might suffer, had it been permitted to subsist."

We see that the well known clemency of CÆSAR did not prevent his being regarded as a Tyrant, and that the attack made on his person was approved of. CATO went a much farther length; he thought that a good King was an impossibility.

If it be advanced, that the doctrine of Pagan authors ought to be rejected by us, I would ask why the sacred writings, which are full of the same doctrines, serve as a foundation for public instruction? But if we are inclined to draw our maxims of Government from the sacred volumes, it will be much worse. The doctrine of *King killing* will be found established by the Prophets, and Kings rejected, as the scourges of GOD---families murdered, and the people exterminated, by order of the All-Powerful---a furious intolerance preached up by the Ministers of that LORD who is full of compassion.

Notwithstanding this ineffable doctrine, which to all appearances Princes do not much read, but which Priests read very often, and which the Jesuits know by heart, it is justly established as a principle among civilized nations, that the person of the King should be sacred and inviolable; but the meaning and application are not well determined; one, for instance, asks if this maxim takes place only in the case of legitimate Sovereigns, or whether it ought to take place equally in the persons of Usurpers?---another enquires what is that positive distinction between an Usurper and a legitimate King? It is demanded, whether we are to regard as sacred and inviolable those Princes in whose eyes nothing was ever esteemed as sacred and inviolable? Whether a TIBERIUS, a SARDANAPALUS, a NERO, a CALIGULA, a HELIOGABALUS, an ATTILA, a CHILPERIC, a FREDIGONDE, an ISABEAU of Bavaria, a MAHOMET, a CHRIS-

TIAN, a PETER the Cruel, a SEXTUS QUINTUS, an ALEXANDER VI. &c. &c. &c. ought to be considered as Sovereigns whose persons are inviolable and sacred? It may be asked if, when there were at Rome two, three, four Emperors at the same time, elected at once by as many armies, all those Emperors ought to be considered as sacred and inviolable?

These questions, and a great number of others of a similar kind, respecting which men are killing each other since the beginning of time, stand in great need of a good solution---but it appears that it is reserved for the *Canon* Law to be always that which is termed the *ultima ratio regum*.

Since then it is power which in the last resort decides every thing, it is not astonishing that the Jacobins had the right on their side at first, and after them the Directory, then BUONAPARTE, and finally the BOURBONS, whose family possessed the right first of all, during fourteen centuries, and, I believe there is nobody in France who does not wish that they should continue to enjoy that right; but as it is acknowledged that there is no well-founded right where there is not power, it is therefore necessary to act in such a manner as that the BOURBONS may not lose their power, and still more that one part of this force may not turn against the other: now this is, nevertheless, that which will happen, if extinguished Party be kindled afresh---if the *ci-devant* Royalist and the *ci-devant* Republicans are distinguished anew---if there be a disposition to date our regeneration from an epoch anterior to that of the Constitutional Charter.

The return of the BOURBONS produced in France an universal burst of enthusiasm---they were welcomed

with an inexpressible overflowing of the heart; the old Republicans sincerely participated in the common joy. NAPOLEON had oppressed them in particular so very severely. All the classes of society had suffered to such a degree, that not a man could be found who did not feel a sort of intoxication, and who did not deliver himself up to the most consoling hopes; but the horison did not remain long uncovered with clouds, joy continued but for a moment. Those who returned after such a long absence, thought, apparently, to find France as it was in 1789; but the generation was almost entirely renewed, the youth of the present day has been brought up in other principles: the love of glory above all has struck deep root: it has become the most distinguished attribute of the national character. Exalted by continual success for twenty years, it had met with a small degree of irritation by a momentary reverse---unfortunately it has received a deep wound from the conduct of the new Sovereign.

Formerly the Kings of England came to render homage to the Kings of France, as to their Sovereigns:--- but LOUIS XVIII. has, on the contrary, declared to the PRINCE REGENT of England, that under GOD, he owed his crown to him; and when his countrymen flew to meet him, and in order to decree that crown to him by an unanimous vote of the nation, he was instructed to answer, that he did not wish to receive it from their hands, that it was the inheritance of his fathers---Then were our hearts closed---they were silent.

It is thus that LOUIS XVIII. was made to begin his part in the midst of us by the most violent of all outrages which a sensible and amiable people could receive. However, we had made no calculation in our sacrifices

to recover the son of Louis IX. and of Henry IV. We smoothed the way to the Throne for him by shewing our eagerness to adhere to the, perhaps, inconsiderate measures of the Provisional Government; in the liveliness of our satisfaction we had spontaneously abandoned our conquests, we gave up from our national limits that flourishing Belgium, which joined its wishes to our's for its re-union to France. A stroke of the pen sufficed to make us give up those superb countries which all the forces of Europe would not have been able to take from us in ten years. Was Louis, then, under the necessity of imitating the Usurpers, who, not being able to become Kings by the assent of the people, make themselves Kings by the Grace of God? Did he not know that we have had Napoleon, by the Grace of God, and that it was by the Grace of God that the most powerful have been always, and will be always seen to reign?

Louis caused himself to be preceded by proclamations, which promised an oblivion of the past; which promised to preserve to each man his situation, his honours, his salary. In what manner have his Counsellors made him keep his promise? By causing him to drive from the Senate all those who might have appeared guilty in his eyes, had he not promised to forget every thing. But not an individual of those against whom the public opinion was raised---not one of those who, by the poison of their flattery to Napoleon, had reduced the French to the last degree of debasement. Thus it appears more and more evident, that flattery is the first want of Princes, under whatsoever title they may reign.

In the same manner were excluded, with the most extreme diligence, those functionaries of a secondary

class, whom perhaps an excessive love of liberty might have led astray. It is true that they have not as yet been formally proscribed---they are not as yet given up to the tribunals, but they are pointed out by the very fact of their dismissal in their districts, to the animadversion of their fellow-citizens, as being suspected persons, and unworthy of the confidence of Government---they are marked with the seal of reprobation; and, if military men be spared a little:---if there appear a disposition to pardon their victories, which they are content with only marking by the appellation of impious, the reason may be easily conjectured.---Oh! how many heroic actions are condemned to oblivion, if they be not put down to the account of crimes!

The promises of the King should give confidence to all citizens; and notwithstanding this, inquietude hovers over them more and more --- it hovers over their existence — over their honour — over their properties. Men are distrustful of the last thought of a man whom some have caused already, in so short a time, so often to elude his promises. People are desirous to believe that those wrong measures do not proceed from himself, but they inflict on that account a wound no less deep on the Royal Dignity. To pardon is not to forget ---to forget, gains hearts, whilst pardon ulcerates them. If the persons of Kings be justly held sacred, ought not their words to be so likewise, and shew a superiority to all subterfuge? Is that then the loyalty of character which people are pleased always to look upon as the most noble appanage of the House of Bourbon?

When the power of a King over his people is compared to that of a father over his family, the fiction is a happy one; but it is far, very far from the truth. Men speak rather of what ought to be, but not of that which

can be---still less of what is. A good father does not establish odious distinctions among his children. His real quality of father inspires him with sentiments which are the inimitable work of nature, and cannot belong to a Sovereign who is nothing more than a Sovereign. In a word, a father is not vindictive; he often pardons after threatening; but he never punishes after having promised to forget.

It is impossible to conceal that we experience this difference in an acute manner. The return of the Lilies has not produced the effect which was expected from them---the fusion of Parties is an operation which has not been performed: so far from that, Parties, of which a vestige hardly remained, have been renewed. They look at each other---they watch each other---there is no longer either reconciliation or abandonment---false attempts---little meannesses---retrograde steps---strange interpretations given to solemn engagements, have produced distrust and disquietude. The Government has not employed the means which were at its disposal---it has paralysed a part---it has turned that part against itself, by declaring itself against it.

Those persons are very culpable, or very blind, who have commenced by detaching from the cause of the Prince every thing which had borne the name of Patriot, that is to say, seven-eighths of the nation, and have changed them into a hostile population, in the midst of another to whom they have indirectly given a transcendent preference. If you wish to appear at Court with some distinction, take good care that you do not mention that you were one of the twenty-five millions of citizens who defended their country with some degree of courage against hostile invasion; for you will receive for answer that " those twenty-five millions of pretended citizens

were twenty-five millions of rebels; and that those pretended enemies are, and always have been, friends."---But you ought to say, that you have had the happiness to have been Chouans, or Vendeans, or deserters, or Cossacks, or English, or, finally, that having remained in France, you never solicited a place under the ephemeral Governments which preceded the restoration, but for the purpose of betraying them more conveniently, and hastening their downfall. Then indeed will your fidelity be extolled to the skies: you will receive the tender congratulations---the decorations---the affectionate answers of all the Royal Family.

Behold, then, that which is termed extinguishing the spirit of Party---not to see any where but Frenchmen---brothers who have sworn never to call to remembrance their ancient quarrels. But who does not see what this leads to? Who does not see we are thus prepared for the debasement of every thing which has taken a part in the Revolution---to the abolition of every thing which belongs to liberal ideas---to the restoration of national property—to the resurrection of all those prejudices which weaken a people?

According to the *tactique* always used in similar cases, only those are first attacked who have been the most distinguished, for the purpose of proceeding successively to others, and finishing, by involving in the same proscription, every one who more nearly or more remotely took any part whatever in the Revolution---to retrogade if possible back to the feudal system---to the establishment of *serfs*---to those fine days of the Holy Inquisition, the morn of which is commencing to dawn again over the provinces of Spain.

The French Revolution was a composition of heroism and cruelty---of sublime touches and monstrous disor-

ders---But all families which remained in France were obliged to take a part more or less active in that revolution.---All have made sacrifices more or less affecting---all have furnished children for the defence of the country, and that defence has been glorious---all were consequently interested, that success might crown the enterprise:---The contrary has happened. Then those who had shewed themselves in opposition to that Revolution endeavoured to make it appear under the most unfavourable aspect. Glorious events are forgotten or disfigured, an affected contempt is turned towards acts of devotedness which have not been attended with any result; and the cry of indignation is re-echoed against those who may have participated in any manner in any thing which has been done.

Had any thing remained to us, after so many labours and so many victories, we should look upon it as a trophy to which we should be happy to attach our recollections. In like manner an eagerness is displayed to force the restitution of every conquest which we have made, for fear that there might remain any traces of that glory which Republicans had acquired, because that glory was thought to reflect shame on the opposite party: but this same glory had become our idol---it absorbed all the thoughts of the brave soldiers whose wounds had obliged them to quit the combat:---all the hopes of our youth who were making their first campaigns---An unexpected stroke has brought it low: we feel in our hearts a void similar to that which a lover finds who has lost the object of his passion:---every thing which he sees, every thing which he hears, renews his grief. This sentiment renders our existence uncertain and painful; every one endeavours to conceal that wound, which he feels at the bottom of his heart. We regard

ourselves as brought low, notwithstanding 20 years of continual triumphs, because we have lost one game alone, which unfortunately was that of honour, and which became the guide of our destinies.

But this sickly and disordered state of things cannot remain; it is a degree of blindness much to be deplored, which has seized a party almost too small to be perceptible, and which party, admitted to share in a glory which nothing can efface, affects to degrade every thing which form the national glory, and appears not to have entered into the bosom of their mother country, but to debase it, after having for so long a time torn it in pieces. But that nation will soon have recovered from that fit of stupefaction which the sudden appearance of a coalition without precedent must have naturally produced in her---which coalition can never again be renewed; she has again resumed the sensibility of what her own strength is. Those who were thought to have been annihilated, are only dispersed, and should such another crusade recommence, the great people (unfortunately up to this very day too confident) would most probably know how to profit from their experience, to fortify themselves against that unskilfulness and treachery which delivered them up to the discretion of her enemies. A handful of deserters, who had fallen into oblivion, and who did not appear but to gather the fruits of a victory in which they had taken no part, which now have no support from that league which conquered for them, and who now find themselves thrown into the midst of an immense population, imbued with liberal ideas, cannot impose on that population for any long time, and it would be an ill calculation on their part to suffer the predominant dispositions of the people to appear. The extinction of all parties is the only thing which suits them, and which suits every one.

It is in the Constitutional Chart that we should search for the common safety: that contains a guarantee for the safety of us all, upon which we can rely---if we do not suffer it to be entrenched upon. But it is necessary for this purpose that the truth should reach the ears of the Sovereign, and that he should not suffer his flatterers to cause him to deviate from the dispositions of that fundamental law which is his own work. The two Chambers must continue to display that character which they have already shewn on some occasions. It is indispensibly necessary that the new elections which are to take place be not the fruit of cunning or intrigue. The true Patriots, that is to say, those who have fought for their Country, constitute every where an immense majority; it belongs to them alone to give a good representative body to the nation; they have only to return such citizens as are distinguished for their former probity, the fathers of families, the purchasers of national property, men interested in every way to prevent the nation from falling into debasement, in order that neither anarchy or despotism should again raise their heads.

The Military returned to their homes are the depositaries of the national glory, and, above all---for the preservation of that *importunate* glory, which certain men shew a disposition to tarnish---Let those brave men feel sensibly that that glory is at this day not their recompense alone, but the *paladium* of whatever liberty remains to us.

Far from me be the most distant thought which could afford the least pretext for new troubles. On the contrary, I complain bitterly of those which some men are endeavouring to excite by forming new parties; it is a certain fact that there were no parties at the time of NAPOLEON'S resignation; it is certain that parties now exist, and it is assuredly not the former Republicans who have excited them.

It was not they who filled the Journals with *diatribes* against themselves; it was not they who caused incendiary writings against the Constitutional Chart to be hawked about, which Chart is their guarantee---It was not they who counselled his Majesty to elude the accomplishment of such promises as were favourable to them, and to fail in his royal word. Why, contrary to that word, are distinctions made, and those distinctions marked more strongly than ever, between those who remained attached to the person of the King, and those who remained attached to the soil of their country? That distinction was natural so long as the one was in arms against the other, but it ought to have been effaced as soon as the former repassed the sea which separated them---When they set their feet again on their natal soil, they then pretend to return as conquerors, who were reckoned as nothing in the crisis which has just passed!

Do they think to bring us back to the epoch of 1789, as if reason could retrogade? Do they hope to make us proclaim aloud that the entire Revolution is but a heap of crimes, when the Revolution presents no other than those of which they themselves have been the first cause? It is always the defenders of the soil which form the imperishable body of the nation---of this nation, powerful---this nation victorious, for so many years! They will not submit that their laurels be touched, but will share them in a fraternal manner, if the others are worthy of them, but certainly they must not tarnish them.

What was it which made us support the tyranny of NAPOLEON? It was because he had exalted the national pride. With what devotedness did not even those serve him who detested him the most? It was despair alone which caused his eagles to be abandoned. His character imposed upon men, to the last moment, and even in his

distress he treated on equal terms with the Allies, who dictated laws to us within the walls of Paris.

The rights of succession are but little regarded by a warlike people—This is not theory, but fact. In the early ages of our monarchy, the Crown was not always conferred on the eldest child, but on him who appeared the fittest to command the armies.—Nature appears to have put in the heart of man a particular propensity to military glory---It electrifies nations, even down to the lowest individual.

You draw tears of tenderness from the eyes of the nation, or of the family, when you recount one single act of honourable warfare. Why did the people of France shew their love so strongly to their Kings? It was because they looked upon them as the guardians---as the protectors of their glory: it was because they were accustomed to regard their King as the most valiant of their Knights. The mass of the people are not acquainted with genealogies, and never discuss the point of hereditary right: they do not take any part in the quarrels of them who govern them---in their private conduct---nor even in their political crimes, only as far as they touch upon their own proper interests. It results from their instinct that they judge that the right of governing belongs to him who governs well, and that that right is forfeited when they are badly governed. He who renders them happy is legitimate enough, or he is very soon legitimated. The Romans soon forgot the first years of AUGUSTUS, because the Emperor knew how to make a paternal Government succeed the horrors committed by the *Triumvirs*. The English still respect the memory of the usurping despot WILLIAM the CONQUEROR, because he made them a great people.

They rank the capricious and sanguinary HENRY VIII. in the number of those who have most contributed to their

prosperity, because he liberated them from their subjection to the court of Rome. They honour CROMWELL, who sent their legitimate King to the scaffold, because the Protector knew how to reign better than the King, whilst, in a short time after, they again expelled their new legitimate King, JAMES II. for the purpose of raising a new usurper to his place. The French applauded the usurpation of PEPIN LE BREF, in the time of the Kings of the Merovingian race, and afterwards the usurpations of EUDENS, and of HUGH CAPET under the descendants of CHARLEMAIGNE, because the new Princes governed better than those whom they had dethroned.

France had already subscribed to the usurpation of NAPOLEON, and perhaps might have confirmed him in the name of *Grand*, which his flatterers were rather too eager in bestowing on him, were it not for the perfidiousness and extravagance of his last expedition; and that nation will be more rigorous, perhaps, at this day, towards her legitimate Prince, because men always think that they have a right to expect more from him who comes to them, than from him whom they oblige to resign. When any man expels another, that he may occupy his place, he takes upon himself an engagement to act better than he.

Some men are terrified by the mere sound of the word *Liberty*, because they judge of it agreeably to Revolutionary ideas, without thinking, on the contrary, that that Revolution was one continual despotism. Alas! the whole history of the world hardly offers a few pages which may be consecrated to record the effects of real liberty. That history is not much more than a monotonous view of the eternal abuse of power. The people are represented in history only as the instruments and the victims of the ambition of their

Chiefs, We only behold there, Princes who engage their subjects in wars for their own private interests—Kings who are themselves nothing better than regicides and parricides—Priests who excite to carnage, and who erect the funeral pile. We can only on some occasions remark the generous efforts of some intrepid men, who devote themselves to deliver their countrymen from oppression. If they succeed they are styled Heroes—if they fail they are called factious.

Our Revolution which appears so terrible when viewed at a short distance, how will it rank in the annals of the world? What are those events of which we have been witnesses, after the barbarians had invaded the Roman empire? What, those after the massacres which the discovery of the new world has occasioned? What, after those wars of extermination which have so often depopulated Asia,—countries larger than all Europe? But we see in the world but the imperceptible point which we occupy: we resemble a nation of ants, which imagine that they see the dissolution of the universe, because a traveller has heedlessly trampled upon their habitations. Well then! these great catastrophes, were they the effect of liberty, or that of ambition?

In the state of nature man is cruel only from necessity; in the social state he is so from caprice—to satisfy imaginary wants and passions which spring up in crowds from communication with their fellow-creatures.

I do not desire to give the state of nature the preference, but the social state is susceptible of an infinity of gradations, one of which systems would be that of total isolation, and the other that of the most complete despotism. Now both these extremes are equally vicious, and in their results are confounded together, for it is

evident, cruel experience proves it, that in both one and the other, neither knowledge or industry, or national prosperity, can exist. There is therefore a problem to be resolved, and it is that of discovering the point between those two extremes where we ought to stop, namely, to distinguish what is the character of a just liberty, and of a legitimate government,---but where shall we find in this way the measure of good and bad? Is it by reasoning alone? Is it in the authorities which writers furnish, or, finally, in that of experience? The insufficiency of mere reasoning is sufficiently proved, as I have before remarked, in those errors of every kind which it leads us into.

Nature has its moral, as well as physical laws, and the one are as difficult of discovery as the other. Experience is only that which can inform us, and it is only on that as a proper basis that we can establish solid principles and solid reasoning.

Man in the state of nature is under no greater restraint than any other animal. Every thing in that state has a reference to his physical wants, but we consider in this place only the social man; we set out with the supposition that he lives with beings like himself, and that the most desirable state for him, is that of a well-organized society, where men afford each other mutual assistance; so that the point which we are to investigate is how that society should be constituted, so that it may arrive at the highest degree of prosperity of which it is capable.

Now we are of opinion that this *maximum* of prosperity cannot be found in an absolutely isolated state; inasmuch as the very first succours, were it even those which a mother affords to her children, would not be ad-

ministered. This state of things, therefore, not only does not attain the end, but it is even absolutely impossible; it is therefore proved that the most desirable state of civilization requires the sacrifice of a portion of our natural liberty.

But experience also demonstrates, that under an absolute despotism, which is the other extreme, knowledge becomes extinct by insensible degrees; the arts cease to be cultivated, emulation disappears, every one becomes indifferent to the national glory and to national prosperity: so that agriculture, commerce, and population are gradually annihilated.

It is, then, at a point between absolute liberty and absolute power that the *maximum* of national prosperity, of which we are in search, exists; we mean, that it is indispensibly necessary to obtain it, that on the one side liberty should be confined within certain bounds, and on the other, that power should be under some limits. Now it is this liberty, thus restricted, that I call *social liberty*, and this power, thus limited, that I name *legitimate power*.

It is therefore necessary that, among citizens, the one should renounce their chimeras of absolute liberty, and the other their pretensions to absolute power, which cannot be supported. It is necessary that on each side a generous abandonment of every thing which might injure that state of prosperity which should be the object of the general wish, should take place. It was certainly with such a reflection that the Revolution ought to commence, and then the Revolution would not have taken place.

That we may fix as precisely as possible the point where it is proper to stop between the two extremes of

which we have spoken, it is necessary to ascertain the most perfect state of society, that with the existence of which no man can flatter himself; but it is sufficient for us to conclude, that we have made the nearest possible approach to it, in order that we may establish the existence of the principle, that such a state of things can neither be reconciled with indefinite liberty or absolute power.

The Social State may be organized in different ways, and receive an infinity of modifications; for experience proves that it can prosper as well under a monarchy properly limited, as under a well balanced popular government; and my object is not to have recourse to difficult researches, in which men have so often fallen into mistakes; only one sees that the question is susceptible of different solutions, according to the nature of the governments of different countries, and that there are many points which ought to be common to all, as for instance, the necessity of civil and criminal legislation, —of a public force,—of an administration of finance,— of establishments for the instruction of youth. Although it is not possible to establish in theory the limits of these different powers, we perceive that all of them should not the less be held to have been created for the object of attaining the highest degree of national prosperity, and that consequently, distinction and privileges ought not to be admitted into the organization, but only as far as they have a tendency to accomplish that object alone. They are the wheel work destined to put the machine in motion, but which are not placed there on their own account, and which should even be removed, when they only render the machine still more complicated and add to its attrition. Of whatsoever importance one of

those pieces may be, should it be even as the main spring of a watch, it would be absurd to say that the watch was made for the spring, and not the spring for the watch. Here we have the fable of the belly and the members; the members are not made for the belly, nor the belly for the members, but are all made for the general organisation of the human frame.

But will it be said, although we know that the *maximum* of national prosperity is the great and only end which we should propose to ourselves, if we do not precisely know in what this *maximum* consists, how will we attain it?---what route shall we take in order to arrive at it? and when we shall have discovered it, how shall we determine, each of us, to follow it? To this I answer, that it is by the progress of knowledge that men will successively arrive at the discovery of those routes, and that it is by the formation of a national mind that each person will be directed in the pursuit.

The science of government is brought to perfection by insensible degrees, and, like all the others, by experience and meditation. As soon as every one shall sincerely search for that which is most suitable to the great family, each day will add to the information of the preceding, men will cease to wander in uncertainty, and all will eagerly carry their tribute of intelligence and zeal to the common stock.

But what will be the great moving principle of all those individual efforts? Who will give them that uniform tendency to the same object? It is evident that it cannot be any thing short of a passion which is noble and strong, and that passion cannot be other than that of LOVE OF COUNTRY.

It is necessary, therefore, to generate this love—

it is necessary to create a public spirit—a national spirit.—It is in this that we are deficient, and deficient to such a degree, that we can scarcely form an idea of it, —and that nobody amongst us, to state a fact, comprehends how individual can be sacrificed to general interest—to forget himself for the safety and glory of his country, and that one should perhaps exclude the possibility of his own existence in some measure, if ancient history did not supply us with a proof, and did we not see it exist in a high degree among some neighbouring nations. In England the fortune of each individual is linked with the fortune of the State, every man there is powerfully interested in guarding the State against any perceivable shock, consequently the great majority of the nation is, of course, on the side of Government, and the party in opposition must be very weak. The only use of that opposition is to keep every man in breath, and to render public discussions more profound, and to cause public business to be more carefully examined. These are the reasons why England possesses a national spirit—There is no such thing in France. The fortunes of individuals being likewise portions of the soil, are less connected one with the other—more independent on the management of public affairs, which can to a certain point be exposed to hazard, without making any alteration in their landed property, in which the public fortune is vested. These are the reasons why there is less union in France,—more egotism,—little or no public spirit; and nevertheless one of them is necessary; for nothing less than great passions can form great nations. With one it is the passion of liberty—with another that of conquest—with some it is religious fanaticism — with us it should

be the love of country—that is, of the soil which gave us birth.

France and England cannot be governed after the same manner, relatively to the national spirit, which should be different in the two countries— England, being entirely commercial, ought to be directed by calculation and a taste for hazardous enterprizes— France should be governed by the love of territorial acquisitions.—England places her point of honour in considering herself as the central point of all the maritime operations which unite all nations—France should place hers in profiting from all those gifts which nature has lavished upon her within herself: we should be proud of our own peculiar riches,—bestow our affections on them, and endeavour to spread them uniformly by the facility of our interior communications, without aiming to become the rivals of our neighbours on an element, the supremacy over which geographical position and the system of the balance of power among the nations of Europe appear to adjudge to them, at least for a long time to come.—We would be better employed in confining ourselves to multiply and improve the productions of our soil, than to consign ourselves over to a foreign commerce, which we can never follow but in an inferior and precarious manner, subject to the will of the English, who will always endeavour to make us incur every possible loss.

Such should be the national character which is suitable to the French nation. It is the love of great territorial possession which includes all particular possessions; the love of our soil, collectively considered, its integrity, its improvement, its political independence; the turn of our mind naturally carries us towards this

common end. The French have always been very strong within themselves; and it is as difficult for strangers to maintain themselves in France as it is difficult for the French to establish themselves in a solid manner at a distance from their own homes.

If we once take this principle as our political regulator, we shall have administered a great remedy to that inconstancy---that fickleness which is more closely allied to local circumstances than to that unsteadiness which is commonly attributed to the French character. The French are not more unsteady than the inhabitants of any other country. The Revolution has sufficiently proved that they possess great constancy and great perseverance in their enterprises, when they have before their eyes an object worthy their ambition. They do not deliver themselves up to little passions but when a great one is not presented to them, which fixes the entire people, and ties their individual powers as it were in one bundle together: when, therefore, experience proves that this public spirit is by no means a metaphysical and absurd being, it is the duty of Government to apply every means to create it. It is the duty of Government to collect the scattered elements of this spirit and to set them in motion. The elements of the public spirit are honour, sensibility, urbanity, which the climate seems to inspire---all the qualities by which nature has wished to distinguish nations the one from the other. The art of setting those elements in motion consists in a Legislature----in an education----in institutions appropriated to the end which is proposed.

I am far from being able to examine all those objects; I shall only attach myself in this place to the principal point----honour, which is, properly speak-

ing, the great lever with which nations are moved, and above all the French nation.

We owe perhaps the greater part of our evils to the want of distinguishing between honour and honours. What is there, however, common between those two things?—Honour is the foundation of every thing great which is done in the world---Honours a simple sign of favour, and oftener the mark of intrigue and of a vile complaisance than of real merit---honour excites a generous emulation---honours a base jealousy: these latter render the persons who are distinguished by them indifferent to the interests of the bulk of the nation, and separates him who is clothed with them from the community---the honour of each citizen, on the contrary, is but an emanation or a portion of the national honour.

All that can be said most favourable to what is called honours is, that they are not precisely incompatible with true honour; but a man full of blemishes, stains, and disgrace, may unite in his person all titles; all dignities---all decorations---all honours; whilst a modest man, full of probity---of virtues---of talents---in a word, of real honour, may possess none of those distinctions which are named honours. Honour is inherent in him who has known how to acquire it. Men strip themselves of their honours when they pull off their clothes; but, unfortunately, in the eyes of the vulgar, the latter often dispense with the former, of which they are only the representative mark----It is a kind of false coin which some men often pass for better than that which is free from alloy. Hence the fraud is encouraged, the thing itself is neglected for the sign, and nothing, then, but loss, remains to well-intentioned men.

Without doubt, it is of great advantage to a nation, to be able to pay the most important services which can be rendered it with branches of oak or of laurel---with crosses and with ribbands; but if those distinctions become the price of flattery---of acting the spy---and of services still more shameful, of what utility will they soon become to that nation? Who would be willing to devote himself to the most painful labours---to the most painful privations to obtain them? who will go to gather them in camps, if they may be obtained in handsful in antichambers?

When those decorations, however, have thus become so common and trivial, that even in the eyes of the vulgar it is no longer an honour to wear them, but only a dishonour to be without them, those who despise them the most find themselves often obliged to carry themselves humbly---to intrigue, in order to obtain them; and it is thus that those counterfeit honours end by killing real honour---by producing debasement and denaturalization, when they ought to raise and purify the soul. They substitute vanity in the place of greatness of soul---country is no longer any thing, in the midst of laurels. There is no more aliment for emulation, and ages slide away without leaving behind any recollections of these innumerable puerilities. But how are we to re-establish true honour in its rights, and to reduce to their just value so many parasitical distinctions? By permitting the truth to circulate freely---nothing more is necessary. Therefore, instead of such a multitude of controverted facts, which are employed for interested purposes in order to obtain belief for those who run after honours to engross them to themselves, we shall know what reality the facts which we hear possess---

made clear by the faculty of discussion, they will be stripped of exaggeration and false colours which change their appearance, and imposture exposed shall not succeed in taking possession of those recompenses which should belong to merit alone. Then shall justice openly rendered to this man develope itself more and more---his appeals being no longer strangled by influence and boasting, each man will exert himself to gain the esteem of his fellow-citizens, without any fear of seeing himself thwarted by impudent quackery. The faculties will acquire power from the expectation of public consideration, and every man will be eager to follow the paths traced out for every class of citizens by the mighty prosperity of the nation.

We have already seen that it is by the propagation of knowledge that men can arrive successively at the discovery of those paths; but the free circulation of thought must necessarily perform two services at the same time---namely, to make known the best things and the best men by drying up the sources of error and intrigue.---Such should be the natural effects of the liberty of the press. Effects quite contrary must take place, of course, if it remain compressed.* A division of

* The non-liberty of the press deprives the public of one of their greatest enjoyments, namely, that of discovering truth with certainty: the public must be told expressly, that they are not to give their belief to it, or that they believe one half to be concealed, if they are prevented from having information conveyed to them through a free and open channel: the non-liberty of the press is, as it has been called, and as we feel every day, the exclusive privilege which some men reserve to themselves, of blackening, lacerating, and defaming the characters of whomsoever they please, without granting to him, thus exposed to a moral death, the privilege of complaint. In one of those pamphlets which ap-

powers is sought after, which, instead of perpetually opposing one another, unite, on the contrary, for the purpose of accomplishing the same end. These powers should be, the POWER of OPINION and the POWER of ACTION:---the first searches out the road which leads to prosperity,---the second directs in that road all individual efforts. What signifies a light agitation, which has only for its object to discover what is useful? A dangerous agitation is never but that which the factious produce; and what faction can there be, if every one be animated with the same spirit—If distinctions be no longer the work of caprice, but that of a just discernment enlightened by the analysis of facts---if every one acknowledges the necessity of a power, and of the sacrifice of a portion of his liberty? Now, we are sufficiently ripened by experience to be deeply penetrated by these maxims. And if there remain yet any individuals filled with old prejudices in these respects, or obstinate in their exaggerated opinions, they will find themselves so lost in the number of those who are fatigued with the Revolution, that they will soon be ashamed of their absurd character; and for this the will of the Prince alone is wanting—that is the queen be-

pear as if written under the dictation of the furies, a most ingenious method has been suggested to the King, of escaping, at once, from all the obligations which his Majesty thought proper to contract towards the people of France, in order that he might mount the throne of his fathers; that is, to declare that he has *said* so and so, but not *promised*. We must agree that such juggling as this would do honour to the genius of the Reverend Father Escobar: is it to a King of France—to a Bourbon—to a son of Henry IV. that it is proposed to act such an ignoble part in the face of nations?

of the hive: it will be followed universally as soon as the signal is given, and that it shall be known that he desires only the common safety, without any exception of persons.

I admit that such principles are far different from those dark maxims *Divide et Impera*. May, therefore, my fellow-citizens see in those hasty reflections nothing more than the sincere desire of preventing every new reaction—of inspiring the noble sentiments of that universal benevolence which leads them not to exact from others more than they themselves are capable of performing. May they feel the necessity of sacrificing their individual pride, which divides all—to the national pride which re-unites all—not to think themselves superior to others by nature, but only by their place in the social order—to comprehend that the true end of governments is to maintain harmony between all the parts—that those useless distinctions are always odious or ridiculous, or subversive of emulation—that it is to this same social order that all the exertions of individuals should have reference—that it is susceptible of an infinity of different forms, between which faults and advantages are divided—that they all require the exercise of power of some kind, and consequently the sacrifice of a portion of our liberty! May they, finally, perceive that it is better to put up with some inconveniences, than to aim at a perfection which in practice is a chimera, and the theory of which is too uncertain—that the most useful principle in morals is to learn to be contented with one's lot—and that Nature, full of wisdom, has established a kind of compensation between men, which knows that the inequality of condition between them is almost always more apparent than real.

As to you MINISTERS who enjoy his Majesty's confidence, you doubtless deserve it by your talents, and your devotedness to his sacred person, but you do not know how to encrease the number of his friends—you are labouring incessantly in disuniting those whom you ought to unite together—you exasperate more and more thousands of people who wish for nothing but concord: you do not inform the SOVEREIGN that in the heart of a King the interests of the great family ought to prevail over all private affections.—Have you already forgot that NAPOLEON has not fallen from such an eminence but for no other reason but because he would not suffer the truth to be mentioned, or that any one should tell it to the French nation? Is it consistent with the dignity of a Prince to quibble on some obscure expressions of the constitutional chart, as if he was already sorry for having given it to us?—and in case of any doubt arising, should it not always be interpreted in the most liberal manner?—Should not a King rather go beyond, than stop short of what he has promised? and ought you not perpetually to remind him of that sublime passage in the Proclamation of his ancestor, Henry IV. when he was nothing more than King of Navarre—"*Who can say to the King of Navarre that he has ever forfeited his word?*"

JUSTIFICATORY STATEMENTS.

PROCLAMATION OF THE KING.

LOUIS XVIII. &c. &c.

THE moment is at length arrived, when Divine Providence appears ready to break in pieces the instrument of its wrath. The usurper of the throne of St. Louis, the devatator of Europe, experiences reverses in his turn. Shall they have no other effect but that of aggravating the calamities of France; and will she not dare to overturn an odious power no longer protected by the illusions of victory? What prejudices, or what fears, can now prevent her from throwing herself into the arms of her King, and from recognising, in the establishment of his legitimate authority, the only pledge of union, peace and happiness, which his promises have so often guaranteed to his oppressed subjects?

Being neither able nor inclined to obtain, but by their efforts, that throne, which his rights and their affection can alone confirm, what wishes should be adverse to those which he has invariably entertained --- what doubt can be started with regard to his paternal intentions?

The King has said in his preceding declarations, and he reiterates the assurance, that the Administrative and Judicial Bodies shall be maintained in the plenitude of their power; that he will preserve their places to those who at present hold them, and who shall take the oath of fidelity to him; that the Tribunals—depositaries of the laws, shall prohibit all prosecutions bearing relation to those unhappy times, of which his return will have for ever sealed the oblivion; that, in fine, the code polluted by the name Napoleon, but which, for the most part, contains only the ancient ordinances and customs of the realm, shall remain in force, with the exception of enactments contrary to the doctrines of religion, which, as well as the liberty of the people, has long been subjected to the will of the tyrant.

The Senate, in which are seated some men so justly distinguished for their talents, and whom so many services may render illustrious in the eyes of France, and of posterity,—that corps, whose utility and importance can never be duly appreciated till after the restoration,—can it fail to perceive the glorious destiny which summons it to become the first instrument of that great benefaction which will prove the most solid, as well as the most honourable guarantee of its existence and its prerogatives?

On the subject of property, the King, who has already announced his intention to employ the most proper means for conciliating the interests of all, perceives in the numerous settlements which have taken place between the old and the new landholders, the means of rendering those cares almost superfluous. He engages, however, to interdict all proceedings by the Tribunals, contrary to such settlements,—to encourage voluntary

arrangements, and, on the part of himself and his family, to set the example of all those sacrifices which may contribute to the repose of France, and the sincere union of all Frenchmen.

The King has guaranteed to the army the maintenance of the ranks, employments, pay and appointments which it at present enjoys; he promises also to the Generals, Officers, and soldiers, who shall signalise themselves in support of his cause, rewards more substantial, distinctions more honourable, than any they can receive from an Usurper, always ready to disown, or even to dread their services. The King binds himself anew to abolish that pernicious conscription, which destroys the happiness of families and the hope of the country.

Such always have been---such still are, the intentions of the King. His re-establishment on the throne of his ancestors will be for France only the happy transition from the calamities of a war which tyranny perpetuates, to the blessinge of a solid peace, for which Foreign Powers can never find any security but in the word of the legitimate Sovereign.

Hartwell, Feb. 1, 1813. L.

PROCLAMATION OF MONSIEUR,

THE KING's BROTHER.

We, Charles-Philip of France, son of France, Monsieur, Count of Artois, Lieutenant General of the Kingdom, &c. &c. &c.

To all Frenchmen, greeting.

Frenchmen!---The day of your deliverance approaches; the brother of your King is arrived among you: it is in

the middle of France that he wishes to erect the ancient standard of the lilies, and to announce to you the return of happiness and of peace, under a sovereignty affording equal protection to the laws and to public liberty.

No more tyrants—no more war---no more conscriptions---no more *droits reunis* (tripple assessments); let your misfortunes, at the voice of your Sovereign---of your father, be effaced through hope; your errors by oblivion; your dissensions by that union of which he wishes to be the pledge.

The promises which he this day solemnly renews, he burns to accomplish, and to signalize by his love and his goodness, the fortunate moment which, in bringing him back to his subjects, is about to restore him to his children.

The Answer of the KING to the PRINCE REGENT of England.

I beg your Royal Highness to accept my most lively and sincere thanks, in return for those congratulations which you are so kind to address me. I return you my particular thanks for the constant attentions of which I have been the object, as well on the part of your Royal Highness, as of every member of your illustrious house. To the counsels of your Royal Highness, to this glorious country, and to the courage of its inhabitants it is, that, under Providence, I shall always ascribe the re-establishment of our house on the throne of our

ancestors, and this happy state of things, which promises to close the wounds, to calm the passions, and to bestow happiness on all people.

The Answer of MONSIEUR, the King's Brother, to the Senate.

I thank the Senate for what they have done for the happiness of France, by recalling its legitimate Sovereign. The King and his family will sacrifice their days to the happiness of the French people: there can be but one sentiment amongst us: all that is passed is forgotten; from this day we are a nation of brothers. During the time that I shall be at the head of the government, (a time that I trust will be very short), I shall employ all the means in my power to promote the public happiness.

The Answer of MONSIEUR, the King's Brother to the Legsilative Body.

We are all Frenchmen---we are all brothers. The King is about to arrive amongst us: his only happiness will be to establish the prosperity of France, and to forget past evils. Let us no longer think but of the future. The King and I have felt, in the most lively manner, the merit of your courageous resistance against

tyranny, at moment when there was great danger in speaking against the cruel tyranny which oppressed France;----in a word, we are all Frenchmen.

Articles 8, 9, and 11, of the Constitutional Chart.

Art. 8. Frenchmen possess the right of publishing and printing their opinions, conforming themselves to the laws which should repress the abuse of that liberty.

Art. 9. All property is inviolable, without any exception of that which is termed *national*, the law making no distinction.

Art. 11. All inquiries respecting opinions, and votes given up to the time of the restoration, are forbidden;--- the same oblivion is recommended to the tribunals and citizens.

MEMOIRS OF M. CARNOT.

L. N. M. CARNOT, the subject of these memoirs, was born at Nolay, in Burgundy, in the year 1753. His father was a very respectable advocate, but not rich: he placed his son early in the artillery, in the study of which he made considerable progress, and was promoted through the interest of the Prince of CONDE.—Before he was twenty he published some mathematical essays, an eulogium on Marshal VAUBAN, (for which he obtained a prize from the Academy at Dijon,) as also some fugitive poems, for which he was chosen a member of several learned Societies. He was a Captain in the Artillery at the time of the Revolution, and although he owed his education and advancement in life to the Prince of CONDE, he nevertheless became its most violent partizan. In September 1791, the department of the *Pas de Calais* elected him a Member of the Legislative Body. One of his first public speeches which he there delivered was for the impeachment of the French Princes of the Blood. He afterwards proposed substituting serjeants for officers, and made a motion that the principle of passive obedience to the officers should be erased from the regulations of the army. His next motion was, that 300,000 pikes should be manufactured for the purpose of arming the *sans culottes*. On the 9th of June, 1792, he obtained a Decree to honor the memory of General THEOBALD DILLON, who was murdered at Lisle by his own soldiers.

After the 10th of August, CARNOT was sent to the army of Marshal LUCKNER, to notify the abolition of Royalty. He was appointed a Member of the Convention, and voted for the death of LOUIS XVI. without an appeal to the people. Shortly after that unfortunate catastrophe he was sent as one of the represen-

tatives of the people to the army of the North, where on the field of battle he cashiered General GRATIEN, who had retired before the enemy, and he himself marched at the head of his columns. On his return to the Convention he was appointed a Member of that Committee of General Safety which governed in the name of the Convention, and was itself governed by ROBERSPIERRE, to whom alone the sanguinary measures which characterized the Reign of Terror were afterwards imputed. Then began CARNOT's great influence in military affairs: being master of all the plans which were deposited in the public offices since the time of LOUIS XIV. he directed the operations of the French armies, shewed himself extremely jealous in this species of glory, and even wanted to claim the success of the battle of Maubeuge, gained by JOURDAN, at which he was present as Commissioner from the Convention. It cannot be disputed that the plans and instructions he delivered in the name of the Committee of Public Safety, contributed to the victories of the French. On the 1st of April, 1794, he caused the Executive Council to be abolished, which was succeeded by twelve acting commissioners: on the 5th of May following he was chosen President of the Convention.

CARNOT has been reproached with signing all those sanguinary decrees with ROBERSPIERRE and others, which brought so much misery on France, although he occupied himself in the Committees of Public and General Safety, principally with military affairs, nay even some of the most atrocious official letters were signed by him, BILLAUD DE VARENNES and BARRERE, to which ROBERSPIERRE's name is not affixed: the following addressed to JOSEPH LE BON, the Pro-Consul, at Arras, deserves to be particularly noticed. It is dated 16th Nov. 1793, and is extracted from the *Moniteur*.—"Dear Colleague,—You are to take the most energetic measures, which the public safety require. Continue in your revolutionary attitude.—The amnesty which was proclaimed by the deceitful Constitution of 1791, is a crime which cannot be palliated by others. Delinquencies against a Republic are not to be forgiven—they are expiated by the sword. Cause the travelling expences of the denunciators to be discharged by the treasury; they have deserved well of their country. Shake fire and sword over the heads of traitors. Always march on this revolutionary line which you boldly trace out: the Com-

mittee applaud your labours. All those measures are not only permitted to you, but commanded by your mission."

The violent measures adopted at Orange, in the department of Vaucluse, are particularly ascribed to CARNOT. When ROBERSPIERRE fell, CARNOT continued in the Committees, and he then accused CARRIER and TURREAU with their sanguinary conduct in La Vendee. In a report which he made to the Convention, on the 2d of Jan. 1795, respecting the successes of the French army in Flanders and Holland, CARNOT endeavoured to revive the decree of ROBERSPIERRE, that no quarter should be given to the English. This motion excited murmurs, and TALLIEN accused him of aping BARRERE. When the latter was, in his turn, accused by the Convention jointly with COLLOT D'HERBOIS and BILLAUD DE VARENNES, as accomplices in ROBERSPIERRE's cruelties, and were ultimately sentenced to be deported to Cayenne: an exception was made in favour of ROBERT LINDET and CARNOT; of the latter it was said, by BOURDON DE L'OISE, "that he was the man who organized victory," yet CARNOT was not much inclined to be exempted from the charges in which BARRERE and the others were implicated; and on that occasion he made the following curious speech:—

"Behold (said he) into what an abyss they wish to drag you! By directing against you the double accusation, the dilemma of barbarity or of weakness, they wish to bring you to agree that you were all the accomplices of Roberspierre—the one party by cruelty, the other by cowardice; but citizens, it is only the abettors of *the system of debasement, or of the absolute dissolution of the national representation*, who either do not know how, or do not wish to answer such pitiful arguments. I myself, citizens, declare, that on every occasion you have done that which you ought to do—that you could not have followed a different line without overturning the basis of the democracy to which you have sworn. Citizens, we are in this place discussing principles—we are considering of the manner of avenging the national representation, for the outrages which are perpetually committed against it on pretence of excusing it.

"You are the delegates of a free people: that people have not stripped themselves of their rights to invest you with them; it is on the contrary to preserve them that they have sent you hither. You

are not here for the purpose of giving them laws, but to frame, declare, and promulgate those which are the expression of their own will. You have received a tacit but imperative mandate, not from your respective departments—by no means from any one section of the people—but from the whole collective people; it is their will which makes the law, not yours: the declaration of rights has expressly told you so: it tells you that the law is the expression of the general will. Your manner of seeing things, even though it should be better, cannot be substituted in place of that of the people; and it is not your own proper opinion which you can here express, but that of your constituents, that is to say, that which you, in your own consciences, believe to be not the best in itself, but that of the majority of Frenchmen. If you believe that the majority is in an error, enlighten them. But should they obstinately persevere in wishing that which even in your opinion might be against their interests, you ought either to resign or vote as they expect. Such is the irrefragable principle of a representative democracy; otherwise, citizens, we must renounce the popular government; it would be necessary to declare that we are under an aristocratical *regime*, and that we thought it would be better to substitute the will of seven hundred individuals chosen by the people, in place of the will of the people themselves.

"The people may sometimes deceive themselves, but they are never to be considered as guilty—for they would be so against themselves—and besides, citizens, we are not to believe that that sort of instinct—that feeling received from nature, is less certain than our reasoning; experience is not often in favour of speculative truths.

"Now Citizens, those decrees with which they appear to reproach you—those contradictory laws which it was necessary to repeal, was it you that have enacted them? Then would you have been culpable. Or supposing that you have yielded to what you conceived to be the general will, when you voted the law of the *Maximum* for instance, or any other, the question was not to know whether you merchants or you philosophers found this a bad law, but if the people wished it or not. You believed that they desired to have it, and it was your duty to believe it, after the multitude of petitions which were presented to you on that

subject: you have decreed it—you have done your duty. However you have not ceased in your discussions to discover its faults; the people themselves have ascertained them.—You have repealed the law---you have still done your duty.

"Those apparent contradictions—far from imputing to you a wrong, prove on the contrary your steadiness in the line which is traced out to you by the declaration of rights and the principle of representative democracy.

"How great then must be that blindness or that fatal frenzy which serves the designs of Aristocracy and Royalism so very ably to desire that the Convention should appear guilty in the eyes of the people, of self accusation, and self disparagement—that people whom they (the Convention) have represented as they ought—whom they have constantly served with zeal and dignity. Would you wish to call on them to gather the fruits of the numerous sacrifices which they have made? Lay aside your dissentions—adjourn your quarrels, and give them a Government, for you have none. It is necessary for you to say, Citizens, the apprehension of an extravagant responsibility has caused its dissolution."

He from that period was no longer employed in either of the Committees, but retained his seat as member of the Convention. When the Directory was established in 1795, CARNOT was made one of its body, and for some time retained a considerable share of influence; but he let BARRAS take from him the port-folio of war, and from that time became his secret enemy. In 1797 a party having been formed in the counsils against the Directory, he sought to make use of it to overthrow his adversary; this party which had other views, was not his dupe; but he was himself tricked by LAREVEILLIERE, who by BARRAS's direction, seemed for a very short time willing to aid him, but afterwards suddenly joined his enemies, who then involved him in the proscription of the 4th of September, 1797. It was singular enough to see CARNOT, an inflexible Jacobin, and a man who voted for the death of his King, accused of favouring a counter-revolution in support of the BOURBONS. He, however, avoided being banished to Cayenne by escaping to Germany, where he published a work explanatory of his conduct. In this pamphlet which is entitled "An Answer to Bailleul," Carnot shews himself as well provided with reasons, when he attacks his accomplices, as weak when he

pretends to justify himself. He concludes by declaring, that "he is still the irreconcileable foe to kings;" a declaration not a little remarkable, when it is remembered that Carnot printed his book under the protection of the kings who had afforded him an asylum against the rage of the demagogues. A short time after he published a supplement to this work, which contains personalities still more violent. These memoirs, re-printed at Paris in 1799, were read there with eagerness by the enemies of the Directory, which then governed; it then issued an order for the apprehension of the printers; but the blow was struck, and Carnot, by publishing the crimes of his former colleagues, contributed to their downfall, which soon after happened on the 18th of June, 1799. After the Revolution of the 18th of Brumaire, Carnot was recalled to France, and appointed Inspector of the Reviews, in February, 1800: and on the 2d of April, War-Minister, which place he did not keep long, but resigned, on account of a disagreement between him and Buonaparte, although it is well known that the plan of crossing Mount St. Bernard, which led to the battle of Marengo, was planned by Carnot. He then withdrew into the bosom of his family, and was called to the Tribunat on the 9th of March, 1802. He there shewed the same inflexibility of principle by which he was always distinguished; he frequently alone opposed the Government, and voted against the Consulate for life; and when it was proposed to confer the Imperial Dignity on Buonaparte, Carnot delivered the following speech againit it in the *Tribunat*, on the 10th *Floreal*, 1804.

"Among the public Speakers who have preceded me, and all of whom have supported the motion of our Colleague Curee, many have anticipated the objections which might be made against it, and have answered them with as much force of talent as powers of persuasion: they have given an example of a moderation which I shall endeavour to imitate, by proposing other observations which appear to me to have escaped them; and as for those who shall attribute personal motives to me because I opposed their opinions—motives altogether unworthy the character of a man entirely devoted to his country, I shall consign over to them, as a full answer, the most scrupulous examination of my political conduct since the commencement of the Revolution, and that of my private life.

"I am far from wishing to diminish the praises bestowed on the First Consul: were we indebted to Buonaparte for the Civil Code alone, his name would deserve to be transmitted to posterity. But whatever services a Citizen may have been able to render to posterity, reason opposes limits to the national gratitude. If a Citizen has restored public liberty—if he has accomplished the preservation of his country, shall the recompence which shall be offered him be the sacrifice of this very same liberty?

"From the moment that it was proposed to the people of France to vote upon the question of the Consulate for life, every one could easily judge that there existed a latent design, and foresee an ulterior object.

"I voted at the time against the Consulate for life; I shall now vote against the establishment of Monarchy, as I think my quality of Tribune obliges me to do; but it shall always be with the necessary caution not to rouse the spirit of party—it shall be without personalities—without any other passion than that for the public good, and also acting consistently with myself in the defence of the popular cause.

"I always professed submission to the existing laws, even when they displeased me most: more than once have I been the victim of my devotedness to them, and I shall not at this day pursue a contrary course. I declare therefore at the very outset, that though I am combating the proposition before us, the moment a new order of things shall be established—that it shall have received the approbation of the general mass of the citizens, I shall be the first to conform all my actions to it—to give to the supreme Authority all the marks of deference which the constitutional heirarchy will demand. May every member of the great society be able to put forth vows equally sincere, and equally disinterested as my own!

"I shall by no means enter into the discussion as to the preference which in general such or such a system may obtain over such or such another. Volumes without number are extant upon this subject. I shall confine myself to examine in very few words and in the most simple terms, the very particular case in which circumstances have placed us.

"All the arguments offered to us, up to this very day, for the re-establishment of Monarchy in France, are reduced to the asser-

tion that without it there exists no way of providing for the stability of the Government and the public safety—of escaping from intestine discord, and of uniting against foreign enemies:—that the republican system has been tried in vain in all possible ways—that anarchy has been the only result of such great efforts—a Revolution prolonged and continually revived—the perpetual fear of new disorders, and consequently a universal and profound desire of seeing the Hereditary Government re-established—changing the dynasty alone. It is to these points that I am to answer.

"I shall observe, in the first place, that when a government is vested in one man, it is by no means an assured pledge of stability and tranquility. The duration of the Roman Empire was not longer than that of the Republic had been. The internal troubles of the empire were also greater and crimes more multiplied. The Republican pride and heroism—its masculine virtues were replaced by vanity the most ridiculous, by adulation the most vile, cupidity the most unbridled—the most absolute carelessness as to the national prosperity. What remedy did the hereditary quality of the throne afford? Was it not regarded as the lawful inheritance of the House of AUGUSTUS? Was not DOMETIAN the son of VESPASIAN—a CALIGULA, the son of GERMANICUS—a CAMMILLUS, the son of MARCUS AURELIUS?

"In France, it is true that the late dynasty was upheld for eight hundred years, but were the people the less tormented on that account? What intestine disorders—what foreign wars were undertaken upon the pretence of the rights of succession which the alliances of that dynasty with foreign powers gave rise to! From the moment that an entire nation espouses the interests of one family, it is obliged to interfere in numerous events which otherwise would have been of the most perfect indifference.

"We could not, it is true, establish a Republican *regime* though we have attempted it under different forms, more or less democratic—but it is necessary to observe that of all the constitutions which have been successively tried without success, there is not one that has not been produced in the midst of factions, and which were not the offspring of circumstances as imperious as fugitive. Here then are the reasons why they all have been defective. But since the 18th Brumaire we have an epoch perhaps unique in the annals of the world, to provide a harbour against a storm—to establish

liberty on solid bases, approved by experience and reason.—After the Peace of Amiens, BUONAPARTE might have chosen between the Republican and Monarchical system—he might have done every thing he wished, he would not have met with the slightest opposition.

"The depot of our liberty was intrusted to him; had he fulfilled the expectations of the nation which had judged him alone capable of resolving the grand problem of public liberty in all its extended bearings, he would have covered himself with matchless glory—It is true that before the 18th Brumaire the state was falling into dissolution, and that absolute power has drawn it from the brink of the abyss: but what conclusion is to be drawn from that? That which every one knows—that political bodies are subject to maladies which cannot be cured but by violent remedies;—that a momentary dictatorship is sometimes necessary for the preservation of liberty. The Romans, who were so jealous of it, had, notwithstanding, acknowledged this supreme power at intervals: but are we, because a violent remedy has saved the patient's life, to be always administering violent remedies? The *Fabii* the *Cincinnati* and the *Camilli* saved Roman liberty by absolute power—but they did so because they divested themselves of that power as soon as possible—they would have destroyed liberty by the very act, had they attempted to retain this power. CÆSAR was the first who wished to keep it—he was its victim, but liberty was annihilated for ever. Thus every thing which to this day has been said on absolute power, proves merely the necessity of a momentary dictatorship in the crises of the state, but not that of a permanent and immoveable power.

"It is by no means from the nature of their government that great Republics are deficient in stability: the reason is, that being unprovided against internal storms, it is always violence which presides at their establishment. One alone was the work of philosophy, organised in a calm, and this Republic subsists full of wisdom and vigour.—It is the establishment of North America which present the phenomenon, and every day their prosperity receives additions which astonish the other nations; thus it has been reserved for the New World to instruct the Old, that nations may subsist in peace under a *regime* of liberty and equality. Yes, I presume to lay it down as a principle, that when an order of things can be established without being under any apprehension of the influence of faction,

which thing the first Consul might have accomplished, particularly after the Peace of Amiens, and which he has it still in his power to do—it is easier to form a Republic without anarchy than a Monarchy without despotism—for how can we conceive a limitation which is not illusory, in a Government, the head of which holds the entire executive force in his hands, and has all employments to bestow. Men speak of institutions which they say are calculated to produce this effect; but before the establishment of Monarchy is proposed, should not those who propose it have been able to convince themselves previously, and also be able to demonstrate to those who are to vote on the question that such institutions are in the order of possible things—that they are not such metaphysical abstractions as are objected to the contrary system? So far as we have gone nothing has been invented to moderate the supreme power, such as is termed intermediary or privileged bodies. But is not the remedy worse than the disease? For absolute power only takes away liberty, while the institution of privileged orders takes away at once both liberty and equality; and although, even in the first days of our monarchy, the great dignitaries were only personal, it is very well known that they always ended in the same manner as the great *fiefs* in becoming hereditary. Without doubt there would not be any room for hesitation in the choice of an hereditary chief, were it necessary for us to have one. It would be absurd to compare with the Firt Consul the pretensions of a family fallen into just contempt, and whose sanguinary and vindictive dispositions are but too well known.*—The recall of the House of Bourbon would renew the frightful scenes of the Revolution, and proscription would be most assuredly extended to the property, as well as to the persons of almost the entire of the citizens; but the exclusion of that dynasty does not draw along with it the necessity of a new one. Are there men who

[NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.]

* M. CARNOT is himself a living instance of the false and injurious nature of this remark on the dispositions of the family of the Bourbons. Were they vindictive, he would not be now living in the bosom of his country, and allowed to insult the common understanding and moral sense of Frenchmen with the false reasoning and ill-founded invective which abound in so many parts of his "Memorial." What proscriptions have been heard of since the return of the Bourbons?

hope to hasten the happy epoch of a general peace by elevating a new dynasty to the throne? Would not that be rather a new obstacle? Have we commenced by obtaining assurance that the other great powers of Europe will adhere to this new title? And if they do not consent to it, shall we take up arms to force them—or, after having lowered the title of Consul below that of Emperor, will he be satisfied to be Consul with respect to Foreign Powers, whilst he is Emperor with respect to Frenchmen alone?

"Has liberty then been shewn to man that he might never enjoy it? Has it then been incessantly presented to his view as a fruit to which he cannot reach his hand without being struck with death? Thus, then, would nature, which makes this liberty a want so pressing, be inclined to treat us as step-mother. No, I cannot consent to look upon this good, so universally preferred to all others, but as one without which all others are mere illusions. My heart tells me that liberty is possible, and that the government arising from it is more easy and more stable than any arbitrary government—than any oligarchy.

"But, nevertheless,(I repeat it,) I shall be always ready to sacrifice my dearest affections to the interests of our common country; —I shall be satisfied to have once more caused to be heard the accents of an independent mind; and my respect for the law will be so much the more sure, as it is the fruit of long misfortunes, and of this reason, which commands us imperiously, at this day, to reunite, as one body, against the implacable enemy of one party as well as the other—of this enemy, which is always ready to foment discord, and to whom all means are lawful, provided he can attain his end, namely—universal oppression and tyranny over the whole extent of the ocean."*

"I vote against the proposition."

[NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.]

* To judge of your former conduct, when Member of the French Government, I apprehend that you had as much regard for the liberty of the seas as you had for the liberties of the Continent. You could not have forgotten that, when you were President of the Directory, you signed an Arrêté, ordering French cruizers to burn, destroy, and sink British property which might be found on board of Neutral Vessels; and still you accuse the English of being the Tyrants of the Ocean. By the above Arrêté it appears that you respected the Neutral Flag, in the same way as you did the neutrality of several Continental States!

It is necessary to state that CARNOT was the only member of the Tribunate which voted against conferring the Imperial dignity on BUONAPARTE.

In 1806, when the *Tribunat* was suppressed, CARNOT again retired into private life, and soon after published a work on Geometry. He is not a rich man, his only property consists in a small landed estate near Dunkirk. It is well known that he did not enrich himself by the Revolution. He remained in obscurity from that time till last January, when the Allies entered France, and Carnot being not quite at his ease respecting his fate, should the Bourbons be re-established, offered his services to Buonaparte, as appears by the following letter which he addressed to him, and which was originally published in the *Antigallican Monitor* on Sunday the 25th of September last.

To his Majesty the Emperor Napoleon.

Paris, Jan. 24, 1814.

SIRE,—So long as success crowned your enterprises, I abstained from offering such services to your Imperial and Royal Majesty, as might not perhaps have been agreeable to you. Now that bad fortune puts your firmness to the grand test, I no longer hesitate to offer your Majesty the feeble means which I still possess. Trifling, indeed, are the efforts of a man who has passed his sixtieth year; but I think that the example of an old soldier, whose patriotic sentiments are well known, may rally round your Eagles many persons who have not yet made up their minds to what party to attach themselves, and who may allow themselves to be led away by a notion, that to serve their country would be to abandon it.—Those are not my sentiments, however I have differed with you as to the titles which you have assumed, and however I opposed your wishes in giving to France a Regal Government, yet now that our common country is threatened by a foreign invasion, as well as the danger of having the old dynasty forced upon us—a dynasty which almost every Frenchman had sworn to renounce, the restoration of which can only subject our country to all the horrors of discord and persecution, I eagerly wait the opportunity, to shew you and my countrymen, that I have determined to fight for, and die in a cause which I always have, and always shall consider a just cause—the establishment of a Republic in France. Millions of French-

men have moistened it with their blood. The manes of all those brave warriors who have died on the field of honour call aloud for every Frenchman to defend his country against foreign invaders, and against the Bourbons.

You have still time, Sire, to conquer a glorious peace, and to act in such a manner as to acquire the love of the Great Nation.

I am, &c. (Signed) CARNOT.

In consequence of the above letter he was appointed to the command of Antwerp, which town he defended with much bravery, although repeatedly attacked and summoned to surrender, nor would he give up the city, even after the Provisional Government was established in France, till he received the order direct from Louis XVIII. On the 18th of April last he published the following Proclamation at Antwerp. "We, the Governor, Generals, &c. &c. both of the army and navy of Antwerp, adhere without restriction to the acts of the Senate, of the Legislative Body, and Provisional Government of the 1st, 2d, and 3d inst. and swear to preserve and defend this place to the last extremity, in the name of Louis XVIII.."

When Carnot returned to Paris, he had an audience of the French King, and it is reported that his Majesty wished to continue his employment in the army, but that he declined it.—A few months after he wrote the "Memorial" addressed to his Majesty, the Translation of which is now before the Public.

In justice to M. Carnot it is proper to add, that he has always maintained a character for incorruptibility as well as consistency. The former part of the character is justly deserved; but adhering to a system replete with error and crime, may be justly termed obstinate perversity, rather than consistency.

As the *Spectator* observes that people are generally desirous of knowing something of the person of the author whose work they read, the writer of these Memoirs can, from personal knowledge, gratify public curiosity in this respect, by informing them that M. Carnot is of the middle size, regular features and expressive countenance—very pale, cold in his manner, and slovenly in his dress. He has not at all the appearance of a military man.

It is very singular that though M. Carnot is a staunch Republican, the author of this Memoir has often heard him say, that he loved a Republic, but hated Republicans.

The Publisher having informed the Translator that many Persons enquire after the following Letter, he has thought proper to add it to this Second Edition of "CARNOT'S Memorial." *As the reasons already given in the Preface for the publication of the* "Memorial," *are in substance applicable to the publication of the* "Denunciation," *it is unnecessary to repeat them here.*

An Account of the LIFE *of* M. DE LA TOUCHE *will be found to follow the Letter.*

DENUNCIATION

TO

THE KING,

OF THE ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS BY WHICH THE MINISTERS OF HIS MAJESTY HAVE VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION.

BY MEHÉE DE LA TOUCHE,

Formerly Under Secretary of State (*Chef de Division*) in the Foreign Department, and in the War Department.

SIRE,

At the moment of that crisis of danger which the ignorance or despotism of the agents of power have almost always produced, Princes have never failed to discover that they have been deceived, and that things would have taken a different course had the truth been exhibited to them by faithful servants. They have always deplored

(when fallen into the abyss) the fatality attached to their condition, which seemed to condemn them to be the perpetual sport of the passions of their Ministers and Courtiers. Such late regrets sometimes have the effect of absolving them before the indulgent tribunals of their contemporaries; but history, more severe, punishes those faults which have caused the ruin of generations by a measure of justice proportioned to their crimes, and when she traces out with an independent hand the errors of people and of Kings, she with equal justice reproaches the one with that stupid submission, by means of which tyranny has been consolidated, and the other with the little care which they had taken to assure to truth that access to the throne which she ought to find.

Fortunately, Sire, these reproaches will never be deserved by you, or by the people submitted to your Government. Your Majesty is too enlightened not to foresee the case, in which the inexperience of those to whom you have consigned the management of your affairs, might make your Majesty's interference between your Ministers and your people necessary. *Frenchmen*, you have said, *have a right to publish and to print their opinions, only conforming to the laws which should repress the abuse of that liberty.* By making this solemn declaration your Majesty has deprived us of every pretext for complaining, on some future day, of that servitude into which we would have voluntary fallen, should we lay down those arms which yourself has deigned to put into our hands for the purpose of preventing it. Should that misfortune ever happen, you would have a right to say to us:—" Have I not foreseen the possibility of my being deceived? Have not I myself furnished you with the means of preserving me from it? If I was under the

necessity of confiding great powers to my Ministers, have not I given you the means of informing me when they abused these powers? In recovering for you your rights, and in recognizing them, has your Prince told you not to use them but in such manner and circumstances as might best suit those against whom he has provided you with them? This phrase, '*conforming to the laws*,' can it mean conforming to the *caprice*, the *opinion*, the *interest*, or the *will* of a *Censor*? The Ministers are afraid that you might censure their administration! Well, then, it is proper they should fear—it is even proper that their measures should be censured by those who have reason to find fault with them: it is necessary that those censures should be known to me, in order that I might appreciate their merit. Behold the usage which it was my intention to authorise. As to the abuses of the privilege which men may fall into, we have laws proper to *repress* them. Would I have feared those abuses of your rights if I had intended to keep to myself the direction of the use? Could you have forgotten the very words of your King—words so clear, so precise---to admit the interested interpretations of his agents? What terms, what forms must I make use of to verify and consolidate my principles, if an act the most religious, the most holy, the most solemn, of my authority, appeared no more respectable to you than the cavils, so often confuted, of those who had enslaved you?"

Behold, Sire, what your Majesty would not fail to say to us, if, in marching on to a general reorganization under your auspices, we should let go the thread which you have held out to save us!

Fear not, Sire, that we shall again fall into that snare into which every species of tyrants have in turn dragged

us, for five and twenty years, with such deplorable success. Your Majesty hath willed that the press should be free---It shall be so, and you shall be obeyed on this point as well as every other. You have desired to secure to yourself the means of discovering the truth; you have nothing to fear from it; you shall know it, therefore, of whatever kind it may be, and its reign, which shall have commenced with yours, shall be dated from the first year of the restoration.

You are led, Sire, into a deplorable error, if you are persuaded that the public opinion is the same at this day as at the time of your return. That joy, so pure, of which you were at once the witness and the cause, has given place to that dark restlessness, to this general distrust, the ordinary aliment of factions, and the first means to which disorganizers resort. The security which your consoling words inspired, hath fled before those measures of your Ministers, following one after another so rapidly; and those unfaithful or aukward servants have conducted themselves in such manner, as if they had undertaken the task of proving that the consoling principles professed by your Majesty were nothing but a trap to deceive the nation, and one of those means which the machiavelism of tyrants hath always employed to lull their victims to sleep before they sacrifice them.

Deign, Sire, to compare for a moment the paternal intentions which you so happily expressed to us, with the manner in which they have been fulfilled, and your Majesty will then be able to judge of the effect which that comparison should have on the public mind. It is not the few and weak partisans of the government which has been overturned, neither is it the disorganisers and the evil-disposed: it is all France---the most decided

Royalists—the very Emigrants themselves, who fearing, with reason, that the want of concordance which they remark between the sacred promises of your Majesty and the acts of the Government, may introduce new storms, and may put off indefinitely that repose which they as well as we began to enjoy, make with regret the sad recapitulation, a picture of which I think it necessary in this place to present.

A COMPARATIVE EXAMINATION OF ROYAL PROMISES AND MINISTERIAL PERFORMANCES.

The first acknowledgment which has fallen from a source of truth so very respectable as that of a descendant of *Saint* Louis is, that he has been recalled to the throne of his ancestors *by the love of his people.* Why is this acknowledgment of a truth, which does honour at the same time to the nation and Prince—of a truth which erects his new government on the only title which renders it incontestible and legitimate, omitted in the preambles of all the acts of the Royal Authority? Why is it not said, that "our Prince is King by the free choice of the nation," as he is so in reality? Why substitute in the place of this phrase, so beautiful and so true, the old and trivial *formula*, "Louis, by the Grace of God, &c. If it be objected, that a pious Prince, such as ours, accustomed to refer every thing to the will of heaven, has thought it a duty on this occasion to offer to the Supreme Being the homage of the sentiment which prompted the French people to call him to the throne, and that to say, "*King by the Grace of* God,"

signifies, *by the will of the people, in whom* God *has inspired that will*, we shall answer, that the elypsis is too long; that the gratitude of the Prince towards his people could not be too strongly expressed: and we repeat it, that the *formula*, *by the grace of* God, is common and superfluous. Religion teaches us that nothing happens in the world without the permission of God; but God permits many things which the people would not have chosen. God has permitted the reign of the Jacobins (to make use of the expression of M. the Abbe Montesquiou)----he has permitted that of the *Committees of Public Safety*, of the *Revolutionary Government*, of the *Directory*, of the *Consuls*, of an *Emperor*, &c. &c.----all this has happened *by the grace of* God, and nothing of all this by the free-will of the French. The new *formula*, the omission of which I regret, might have contained the ancient:—the ancient does not necessarily contain the new. When a King is affected and is grateful, it is not natural that he should boast of the *less* comprehensive form, when he might quote the *more* in his favour. The same spirit of religion which has consecrated the sentiment that Kings and Shepherds are equal before God, according to our way of thinking, does not permit a modest Prince to think that God is more particularly occupied with him than with every other, and that heaven has decided that it should be Louis, rather than Peter or Philip, who should discharge the duties of executive magistracy in France. That which answered every thing is, that *the French people willed it.* Our good King has on many occasions repeated it; it is therefore against his opinion and his will that the expression is omitted on the most important occasions.

The Ministers have not confined themselves to that,

they have wished to humble the nation, and vilify his Royal Majesty, in a point which must affect the people in the most sensible manner. Our journals make our King acknowledge a kind of homage for his Crown to the PRINCE REGENT of England. They make him say, *that after* GOD, *he owes his Crown to him.* Certainly, if this phrase has escaped from his Majesty, we ought to rank it in the class of those compliments of pure courtesy which cost nothing, and which are given for as much as they are worth; he should make haste to forget it, and by no means give it a place in the annals of his restoration. Besides, it is enough for the national honour and glory, that it has not pleased GOD and the English to re-establish LOUIS XVIII. but when it pleased the people of France no longer to maintain a Government become insupportable.

His Majesty admitted, not many months ago, that he was called to the throne by the love of his people, and his Ministers make him date all his acts from the 19th year of his reign!—What can be the object of a singularity which gives the lie to the Prince himself, to reason and to truth? Are they desirous of making the Prince responsible for the evils which we have suffered during that long period, when we were so plainly deprived both of his counsels and his influence? Would they wish to charge to the account of his Majesty all the horrors of which we have been the victims---the treasons executed in his name against our common country---the massacres of the inhabitants---of all parties--the burnings of our vessels in our ports and harbours---all kinds of plots organised in the interior---the assassinations of couriers---the robberies of coaches---the falsehoods---the calumnies, and all the crimes with which, were it not

for the law of oblivion, we should have to reproach the zeal of those fanatics who at this day pretend to have served their country in serving the enemies of the State? Such a project makes us shudder, and we dare not suspect any one of it.

Do they wish to prove that all our acts, during nineteen years, were so many crimes and rebellions? But from whence then comes this fury of always furnishing us with new crimes? And if the intention be to shew obedience to the King, who hath declared that he did not desire to date it but from the 12th of March, why these excursions into times past?---Why are we always to retrograde?---In a word, why say a falsehood?

His Majesty, on taking into his hands the reins of the Empire has declared, that every thing which had any reference to acts, votes, and opinions, previous to the restoration, should be consigned to oblivion. He has even condescended to make this oblivion one of the principal articles of the Chart, which *enjoins it on all tribunals and to all the citizens.*

The Ministers are, to all appearance, above the tribunals, the citizens, and the Chart itself, inasmuch as that clause was broken the day after its promulgation. Is it by way of oblivion that the authorities and all that belong to them, the priests, the writers, and the journalists, have proclaimed most eagerly those funeral *commemorations* in honour of every one who died victims of their attachment to one of the parties which have divided France? Is it for the purposes of oblivion that all the effects of the civil troubles are successively recalled, which are intended for the memory of those who have suffered under the acts of the opposite party ---that the press, the statuary art, the pulpits, the

theatres, reproduce those acts which it is pretended are consigned to oblivion---that attempts are made to cover France with a funeral crape, and to transform it into one vast lachrimatory?

And what would our Ministers say, if we should choose this moment to renew the funeral homages which we formerly paid to those men who fell on the 10th of August, in the contest of the people against the remaining defenders of the throne---if in those days of general reconciliation we should be disposed to recall to memory the assassinations committed on the patriots at Fort John, at Marseilles, at Lyons, at Avignon, &c. and to call forth unseasonable pity for those victims, immolated, according to the acknowledgment of the assassins, as a holocauste, and in the way of expiation of other assassinations!* Whom do those hypocrites think to impose on, by affecting a grief which does not belong to the nature of man? The most tender father—the most pious son—the most disinterested brother, do not lament but only for a stated time the objects most dear to them. Tears dry up, grief dies away as every thing else, and if at any time the recollection of former afflictions happen to steal a tear, that tear falls isolated and solitary. It was that noise which rendered it suspected, and which does not want journalists or preach-

* I shall not omit observing on the present occasion, that the effects which certain persons doubtless expected from one of those last solemnities, was eluded by the discretion of a worthy priest, M. l'Abbe Duval, who was charged to pronounce the discourse on those who fell on the 2d of September: this discourse, which discovered extraordinary talents, is besides a model of that moderation from which true piety and zeal, which the Gospel admits, never depart.

ers. Virtue is fair of herself---but, gentlemen, true virtue is modest, and yours makes a bustle, the least inconvenience of which is, that most people do not put any faith in it. The wisest way would be to obey the King, by forgetting those things altogether on both sides.

Be convinced, that you are as much interested in this oblivion as we are. It would be painful to us to appear to recriminate; but if the emigrants reproach us with the losses they have experienced during the late war, which is fortunately terminated, we shall reply to them in the language of a character in the fable, to the lioness which had lost her whelp---

Ma commere
Ceux que vous avez etrangles,
N'avaient-il ni pere ni mere?

The KING had promised to leave each person in the post which he occupied; and the agents of the Royal authority are no sooner named, than all the persons employed under the old Government are dismissed, under the specious pretext of economy; but, in reality, to make room for a cloud of Priests, to whose ambition the service of the Altar does not offer any thing satisfactory. Complaints were lately heard of the want which we felt of gentlemen of this profession; there were not sufficient, it was said, to serve the churches! GOD must have worked a singular miracle in their favour, for within these six months means have been found not only to furnish the churches with them, but out of them to furnish Ministers---Administration---- the offices---agencies, and all other posts where there is money to be gained, and heads of families to be replaced. All the acts of authority appear as if they emanated from

a council or a conclave. We are spoken to no longer in any other language, than that of the solemn offices of religion---about processions, and every thing which ought to be absolutely foreign to the Administration of the State. In this, we shall presume to ask, that which his MAJESTY intended when he declared to France, that in the constitution which he gave to it, he wished *to appreciate the effects of the progress of knowledge, which was perpetually increasing---the new relations which this progress had introduced into society---the direction which during half a century it has given to the public mind, &c. &c.?*

The King desires to forget votes and opinions! Is it not insolently opposing the will of the Monarch to drive, as has been done, from every public employment, the men who, in the proceedings of LOUIS XVI. adopted an opinion fatal to that unfortunate Prince? These men are *assassins*, we are told by the Tribunat of our Legislative Chambers, and by the Journals directed by our Ministers! But how long is it since men, constituted judges by a great nation, have become responsible for the sentence which their consciences, well or ill informed, dictated to them? I am far from presuming to set bounds to the opinions of a legislator or a writer, but I will boldly assert, that those who deliver themselves to that effect, deserve a most exemplary punishment, not because they have been unjust or insolent, but because they have violated one of the principal articles of the *Constitution.*

Perhaps it is believed that the nation may be lulled into security, by its appearing that only some hundreds of individuals are persecuted who are accused of this crime; but, in the first place, it is a principle that,

in the social state, the whole society is injured when one individual is unjustly oppressed; and, in the next place, do they think to persuade us that, after those, the much more serious crime of those men will be forgotten, who, not being bound to any thing in this question, have expressed their opinions freely and voluntarily on the great and terrible act of the National Convention? Will it be forgotten, that ninety thousand communes had each of them, at that epoch, two or three committees, who were eager to applaud it to their representatives? Will those innumerable addresses be forgotten, in which men hastened to felicitate the Convention upon that event, and the two thousand signatures which attest the voluntary assent of so many men?

The death of Louis XVI. was, in our mind, unjust and impolitic; unjust, because the person of the Prince has been declared inviolable, and because no previous law was applicable to his situation; impolitic, because injustice is always so; and, besides, a nation which confides in her own strength, should prove her confidence by respecting at least the existence of a Prince whose whole crime was, having followed bad counsels. Such is the opinion which we at that time endeavoured to propagate; but that was but an opinion, and the national authority has pronounced otherwise. The King by closing, or wishing to close the mouths of his faithful subjects on this point, so very delicate, has himself made a sacrifice sufficiently great to enable him to believe most confidentially that he would be obeyed by persons whom that event touched less nearly than his Majesty. An appearance is assumed of prosecuting only a few hundred individuals, but at bottom the cause of those who voted, and that of all those who have approved of the judg-

ment, is the same—It is that of an army of two millions of men, who find themselves obliged at this day to put themselves on their defence against the impolitic attack of those who have dispersed their advance-guard.

Great care is taken, in proscriptions of this nature, to appear to except the army; but besides that, the nature of such considerations as lead to arts of this description, escape nobody: Can the army in such a case be considered distinct from the nation? Are not our soldiers our children—our brothers—relations—friends? Is it possible to menace the families of five hundred thousand men, without menacing those five hundred thousand themselves? Shall each individual soldier be prohibited from returning forthwith into his family, where he will find himself, beyond all doubt, the son, cousin, son-in-law of an assasin or of the partisans of assassination? Is this the manner in which our civil discords are terminated, and shall a handful of fanatics presume after this manner to insult and proscribe two generations?

The journals are ransacked for all printed opinions; all the books in which are given any ideas of those times; and a pretence is set up to arrange these against the will of the King. In the pages of the *Moniteur* published at that time, extracts are made of letters of our Generals, in which they gave to the Legislative Body a favourable account of the dispositions of our armies at those epochs, and a willingness is manifested to extract from that source a considerable quantity of the expressions which the language then made use of furnished against the monarchical regime. But what is gained by this? Some weak men are afflicted, who blush at this day on account of that which they then thought right, whilst reflection, age, and experience, explain so naturally the change

which has taken place in their manner of thinking; they are troubled, and terror is infused into the souls which his Majesty himself undertook to tranquilize, by inviting us to a security so necessary to us all.

The King has desired that no distinction should be made between the properties named national and patrimonial property. We shall not advance that Ministers have directly and positively established this difference, but it exists in fact, and consequently doubts and alarms as to the fate of the Constitution and of France to which it has naturally given rise. It is a fact, that every owner of national property, who might be now disposed to sell or to raise on the said property fortunes for his children, or to borrow a sum of money necessary to put his industry in motion, would be obliged to give up that idea, or to suffer a notable loss, contrary to the wishes of the King and the Constitution which he has given us.

The King has desired that personal liberty should be secured to us. It is with this as the preceding article. No person can depend on this so long as the violation of the other Constitutional articles shall not be punished in an exemplary manner. Besides, who can assure us that no person has been arbitrarily arrested, when the only manner in which we could be informed of it, namely, the information of the journals, is exclusively in the hands of the Ministers—contrary to the intention of the King and of the Constitution—when every article to be inserted in a public paper is searched and measured by a royal Commissary, named by Ministers—when the insertion of one disagreeable paragraph might compromise the existence or tranquility of the author—of the printer—of the bookseller—and of any other person who

might shew it favour? Nothing is in reality securely established whilst there exists in the State any man who has reserved to himself the means of attacking those rights which are troublesome to him.

THE KING HAS DESIRED that his Ministers should be *responsible;* but as this word *responsible* has appeared too clear or too extensive, they have found means of giving to that article, as well as to all others where the will of the King did not admit of any jesuitical distinctions, a small twist, enough to raise, on a future day, doubt sufficient to introduce a grammatical explanation on that subject, such as may suit their purpose. They have added, that they are not to be prosecuted but for treason, and for acts of violence; and it is in the unsettled meaning of the word *treason*, that they hope to find their safety. They will pretend that they have not been guilty of *treason*, so long as they shall not have delivered over the person of the King to the enemies of the State; since it is well known that, according to their meaning, they cannot be guilty of treason but against the King, who has named them to their offices. So long as the Legislative Body shall not have decided, that the depositary of the Constitution, being intrusted to Government, there will be treason committed whenever the Constitution shall have been violated in consequence of the orders of a *Minister*, their responsibility will be an article at which to laugh; and this is so well arranged in their heads, that they make no scruple to execute every day, in the King's name, ordonnances by which they break existing laws, or contravene them, in a most barefaced and criminal manner.

The Legislative Authority is silent under these encroachments of the Government, and authorises, by its

silence, the fears and disquietudes which disturb the nation, and prevent the consolidation of the new order of things which is so very desirable.

Lastly, the King has desired, that the Press should be free. That article had not been printed, when an order was already issued to the King's bookseller, to stop the circulation of every work that might not be agreeable to the *Censors*—that is to say, to every thing which was known to be most basely and most constantly sold to Ministerial despotism—to insolent and ignorant detractors of every thing useful and generous—to those men, in a word, who are, as to literature, what eunuchs are in a seraglio—Appointed to guard objects which they cannot enjoy, they avenge their impotence by exciting trouble and vexation, for the benefit of their masters.

In this respect we certainly might be excused from pushing our reflections further. It is evident that the Constitution is violated, from this one circumstance alone, that the Press is not free. This violation is an evil so frightful, that it may appear superfluous after it to enlarge on the humiliating or precarious situation to which the French nation, in the nineteenth century, is reduced in that point of view which formerly inspired her with a pride at once so noble and so just—that of the pre-eminence to which her literature entitled her. When public liberty is crushed by the violation of that Chart which assured it to us, is it meet to deplore the debasement of literature? Do men think of the loss of their jewels, when their honour and their lives are in danger?

Besides, those who have taken the pains to defend the rights of genius and of thought, consecrated so well by the engagements of the Monarch, and who have so ably supported those rights with all the power of courage and

talent, have taken up only the weaker side of the question. We are not all of us men of letters, namely, we who make an outcry for the liberty of the press, but we are all of us citizens and subjects of the State. Our literature might constitute our pride and riches, but a Constitution, sacredly maintained for all, would have constituted our happiness and tranquility. The liberty of the press guaranteed to us every thing which renders life happy and agreeable. It secures to us our properties—our honour—our lives, and the punishment of any man who would make an attempt against any one of those blessings. The privation of that guarantee delivers us over, as brute beasts, to the chains and scourges of our keepers. I am very eager, doubtless, that men would behold in me the wretched wish to blot over a few sheets of paper when I claim the liberty of the press only against defamatory brigands, who for six francs would butcher any one who might have the honour to incur the displeasure of the tyrants in whose pay they are! I like to be told hypocritcally that I may write a book of three hundred and twenty pages, when I have occasion only to utter these words, THE MINISTERS HAVE VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION!

What reprehensible matter has been printed since the press has been able to enjoy a portion of liberty?

A few anonymous pamphlets (but those which are anonymous, for no other reason but for this alone, that the authors dare not shew themselves) cannot do any harm: some calumnies, but almost all of them had been inserted in the journals submitted to the censors; the answers, which alone should have been admitted, have alone been rejected.

The laws which have been made suffice to insure jus-

tice to those who have been offended, if the tribunals would wish to execute justice against certain protected rascals; and we must hope that that will happen, when it shall please Ministers to organise the tribunals as the constitution prescribes, and cause to be delivered to the judges that Royal Commission which makes them immoveable and independent.

Ministers have not been attacked hitherto, but as far as respects their logic, and the innovations which they wish to introduce into language; and those gentlemen complain already of the opposition they meet with! But it remains with themselves alone to have as many auxiliaries as there are writers honest and attached to the Constitution. There is nothing more required to effect this, than that they would habituate themselves to respect it, instead of looking round for the means of eluding it with impunity. What, besides, is the great inconvenience of seeing Ministers a little disquieted, compared to that of tormenting an entire nation, which sees the dreadful gulph of arbitrary government once more opening before them!

It is well known that they themselves feel the weakness of their reasoning; and for the purpose of interesting some more august personages in their quarrel, it has been contrived to supply idle curiosity with some pages most highly reprehensible, and which have excited the just severity of the Police; but who, at this day, is the dupe of a manœuvre towhich recourse has been had so often? *Fecit is cui prodest.* This is an axiom fitted for all times which can serve to direct our researches. Besides attempts such as these, devoid of reason---those insults offered to the objects of our respect, prove nothing against the liberty of the press, and shew, at

most, only the danger which has been done in the *Moniteur*, of searching for evidence almost always to be suspected, if not palpably false. A law is extant to punish the crime—If it be not entirely complete, let the Ministers propose one which is more so; but let them not make a handle of crimes to prevent the use of our rights.

Should we pass from the examination of the Constitution to that of the the other acts which emanate directly from the King's will, and which have been given us in his presence, it will be immediately seen that the excellent understanding of this worthy Prince has foreseen and ordered that which is convenient to us; but that in every particular he is disobeyed in the subsequent proceedings, in which he is either taken by surprise, or which pass without his knowledge.—The King, for example, has caused to be read before the solemn assembly which received the Constitution, an ordonnance, which excludes strangers from all important functions, not wishing to admit to the right of French citizenship any stranger who had not merited it by some important services. Well! in one month after, the journals informed us that a treatyw as entered into with the Swiss, the conditions of which would place the sacred pledge of the King's personal safety at the mercy of a troop of foreigners. The protection of the person of the Chief of the State, will be confined to men to whom the King is not willing to entrust the exercise of the most insignificant public function, and this too when there are in France 20,000 officers as faithful as brave, who must be reformed from economy. We shall be told that those troops will be taken from among a people distinguished for their loyalty and strict adherence to their engagements; we know

this, but these soldiers are strangers—they are brave and faithful—but they are not braver than Frenchmen: they will not be braver to France than Frenchmen. Their over-scrupulous fidelity is not even without its inconvenience, and contributes very much to the abuses to which it is liable. They have been seen on the 10th of August, without any order from the King, and certainly contrary to his disposition, obeying the impulse of a blind courage, and commencing a combat, which perhaps would not have taken place had Frenchmen been in their place.*

Is not the inconvenience evident, of employing troops in France, who might perhaps think themselves bound to avenge on an innocent people a catastrophe so very lamentable to the regiments which preceded them? The same men who wished for *mutes*, would they have Janissaries also?

We dare not give room to the ominous conjectures

* I made one of a company of grenadiers of the battalion of St. Etienne du Mont. All this battalion was attached to the Constitution, and consequently hostile to the movement directed against the castle. They marched there with an intention of defending the King, but the nature of the manœuvre adopted by their officers, placed them before the Swiss guard. These inconsiderate but brave foreigners thought it their duty to fire on them, and the troops which came to support them, seeing themselves attacked, yielded to the evil genius which directed that day. I do not know how the affair would have passed, had not the Swiss fired—but perhaps it could not have been more unfortunate. I arrived, after an absence of two days, on the evening of the 10th, and found my section assembled. Many of them, who had marched to defend the King, changed by the event, accused and denounced me as an *Aristocrate*, who had refused to march to attack the castle. So much for men *en masse*.

to which so strange a measure, and so little analogous to the state in which we find ourselves, has given rise; that which above all is lamentable is, that the men who provoke the people, are possessed with the unfortunate notion that they are the stronger, and authorised to satisfy this vengeance against the people when they are surrounded by thousands of men!—When will it be acknowledged that real force is nothing but *justice*---that prudence is *justice*---that the security of Government is *justice?*

There still existed a numerous and invincible body of men, already habituated to preserve to France that which they considered the depositary most dear to her; they wanted only one virtue—*Fidelity.* The regrets which have escaped from them, recommended them perhaps more to our Monarch, better advised than the desertion of the men most favoured by the fallen Government.—Behold the warriors whom we think that we might trust! A noble and generous temerity is the prudence of great souls; it is that which the descendant of HENRY IV. would have adopted, had he delivered himself up to his own sentiments—It is perhaps what might have saved us. The measures which the Government takes are not the spring from which proceeds our critique, no further than they are literally contrary to the Constitutional Chart. We shall confine ourselves, therefore, to say, that the calling in of the Swiss guards in France appears to us eminently impolitic, but, if the expression be preferred, that its policy is most rash. We shall presume to foretell, that if it is executed, it will be fatal to France; and though, on a future day, we may be accused of having ourselves prepared the evils with which we are previously so well acquainted, the vain apprehension of being once

more calumniated shall not prevent us from predicting that which appears to result necessarily from the nature of things, and to say before-hand, that when we see the seed bad, a bad harvest must follow.

Behold ! Sire, a picture, rather softened than overcharged with the acts by which your Ministers have destroyed, in the minds of the people, the hopes which caused them to forget their sorrows. Behold the truth which no doubt is concealed from you, and which I thought necessary to be placed before the eyes of your Majesty.

Deigh, Sire, to receive kindly the homage of respectful devotedness with which I am,

Sire,
Of your Majesty,
The very humble, very obedient
and faithful Subject,

MEHEE DE LA TOUCHE.

MEMOIRS OF M. DE LA TOUCHE.

M. de la Touche, the author of the preceding letter, lately addressed to Louis XVIII. was the son of a surgeon, formerly known by the name of Chevalier de la Touche, resided long in Poland and Russia, whence he was driven, in 1792, on account of his revolutionary principles; he then went to Paris, and was accounted worthy of being appointed assistant secretary register of the Commune called that of August the 10th; as such, he, Tallien, and Huguenin, signed a resolution on the 30th, conceived nearly in these terms: "The Council has determined that this night and morning the sections shall, on their responsibility, examine and judge the citizens who are in prison." On the 17th of September, when the section of the French Pantheon was deliberating on the mode of Government which the Convention should be required to regulate, he sent his vote in a billet, thus worded: "If ever a King, or any thing like one, dares to present himself in France, and you want some one to stab him, deign to inscribe me among the candidates. Signed by me, Mehee." He was strongly accused of having taken a part in the massacres of September, but he denied the charge in the most formal and positive manner; he had little weight during the time of the revolutionary Government, which even sent him to prison. After the 27th of July, 1794, he again appeared in public life, connected himself with Tallien, and was one of the principal writers of the numerous pamphlets then directed against the Jacobins, who Mehee ludicrously termed Robespierre's tail.—Most of his writings were signed Felhemesi, the anagram of Me-

hee fils, or Mehee junior. However, when the progress of reaction threatened the Thermidorian party itself, he endeavoured to conciliate the Jacobins, and declared that circumstances had led him farther than he intended to go. In 1795 he even began the Journal of the Patriots of 1789, of which he and Real were the principal conductors, and in which he opposed the system of moderation which signalised the latter part of the reign of the Convention, and brought on the crisis of Oct. the 5th, 1795, at which period it was proposed to raise Mehee to the Directory, and in fact he was, on the 25th of November, nominated Secretary for the War Department, and afterwards for Foreign Affairs; but the accusations of having assisted in the massacres of September were renewed against him with such violence, that he could nto keep his place long at a time when moderation was the ruling principle of Government as well as of public opinion, and he resigned in April, 1796, that he might, as he said, employ his time in justifying himself. He afterwards joined a company of purveyors, who refused to pay him the interest they had agreed on, and against whom he brought an action at law. In July, 1796, Drouet desired to have him for his defender, but he was on the point of being himself implicated in Babeuf's conspiracy. After the revolution of the 18th Brumaire he was appointed Editor of the Freeman's Journal, but he continued in this office only three months, for having thought fit to write against the priesthood, a decree of the consuls ordered his arrest, as having been concerned in the murders of September.—Mehee tried to remonstrate in the public prints and in the courts of law; but he was banished, first to Dijon, and afterwards to the Isle of Oleron, whence he escaped to England, in 1803. He there assumed a new character, and prevailing on Bertrand de Moleville, whom he supplied with materials for his history of the Revolution, to present him to the English Ministry, he represented himself as an enemy to the Consular Government, and as the chief agent of a party which had resolved on its overthrow. He was now furnished with money and instructions, and was sent to Mr. Drake, the British Minister at Munich, who received him on the credit of the recommendatory letters he brought, arranged a correspondence which he was to keep up with him on public affairs after his return to Paris, and gave him more money and fresh instructions. In the begin-

ning of 1804, Mehee arrived in the French capital, and gave an account of the whole to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and obtained permission to write to Drake, who was completely duped by this stratagem. As all this was passing at the time George's conspiracy was discovered, Mehee speedily published an account of his manœuvres, which added to the accusations brought against the English Government. Mehee acquired a great deal of money thus, and again settled at Paris, where he lived at first in some splendour, but soon fell back into that indigence usual with him. He has written a History of the pretended Revolution in Poland, with an Inquiry into its new Constitution, 1792; second edition, 1793: a pamphlet entitled the Whole Truth respecting the massacres committed in September, 1792, and respecting several secret days and nights of the ancient government committees, 1794. In 1791 and 1792 he was editor of the Warsaw Gazette; and in 1800 he published a treatise on the Wounds made by Fire Arms.

FINIS.

WOOD, Printer, 22, Russell Court, London.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

RECD LD-URL

ORION
LD/URL AUG 26 '89
AUG 26 1989

ORION
LD/URL AUG 26 '91

MAR 1 1 1991

Form L9–Series 444

THE LIBRARY

University of California, Los Angeles
L 005 459 693 7
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 449 793 7